

INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER, A.D. 1720.

FIRE. LIFE. MARINE.

ACCIDENTS.

BURGLARY.

EMPLOYERS'  
LIABILITY.

**ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE.**

Apply for further information to  
**THE SECRETARY.**

HEAD OFFICE: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.  
WEST END BRANCH: 29, PALL MALL, S.W.

## LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1833.

Capital Stock ... .. £400,000  
Debiture Stock ... .. £278,130  
REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.  
Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Offices.  
W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

### IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS

**X** In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of **LICENSED PROPERTY** **X**  
To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of  
LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.  
Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to  
**THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND  
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,**  
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.  
Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without  
special valuation and at low rates.

## LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,  
SIMPLE,

**THE PERFECTED SYSTEM  
OF LIFE  
ASSURANCE.**

AND  
SECURE.

FUNDS - - - - £4,400,000. INCOME - - - - £600,000.  
YEARLY BUSINESS - - £2,000,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £16,000,000.

## TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Earl HALSBURY (Lord High Chancellor of England).  
The Hon. Mr. Justice KIRKWOOD.  
His Honour Judge BACON.  
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.  
RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., J.P.

## DIRECTORS.

Bacon, His Honour Judge.  
Baggallay, Claude, Esq., K.C.  
Davey, The Right Hon. Lord.  
Deane, Henry Bargrave, Esq., K.C.  
Ellis-Danvers, Edmund Henry, Esq.  
Finch, Arthur J., Esq.  
Frere, Geo. Edgar, Esq.  
Healey, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., K.C.  
Johnson, Charles P., Esq.  
Kekewich, The Hon. Mr. Justice.  
Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.

Mathew, The Right Hon. Lord Justice.  
Meek, A. Grant, Esq. (Devizes).  
Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., K.C.  
M.P.  
Morrell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).  
Pennington, Richard, Esq., J.P.  
Rawle, Thomas, Esq.  
Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.  
Tweedie, R. W., Esq.  
Williams, Romer, Esq., J.P., D.L.  
Williams, William Esq.

VOL. XLIX., No. 5.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, DECEMBER 3, 1904.

\* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and  
copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on  
the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must  
be authenticated by the name of the writer.

### Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	77	LAW SOCIETIES .....	81
THE REPORT ON THE BECK CASE .....	80	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL .....	87
CONDITIONS OF FORFEITURE ON MAR-	81	LEGAL NEWS .....	83
riage WITHOUT CONSENT .....	82	WINDING-UP NOTICES .....	89
REVIEWS .....	83	COURT PAPERS .....	89
CORRESPONDENCE .....	83	CREDITORS NOTICES .....	90
NEW ORDERS, &c. ....	83	BANKRUPT NOTICES .....	90

### Cases Reported this Week.

<i>In the Solicitors' Journal.</i>		Hubback v. British North Borneo Co.	70
Earl v. Lubbock .....	83	Ogden (Limited) v. Nelson. Same v. Telford .....	71
Hermann v. Charlesworth .....	85	Pease v. Courtney .....	75
Imperial Grand Hotel Companies (Lim.) v. Christchurch Guardians Assessment Committee .....	84	Pretoria - Pietersburg Railway Co. (Limited), In re .....	74
Whiting's Settlement, Re. Whiting v. De Rutzen .....	83	Strand Wood Co. (Limited), In re .....	69
<i>In the Weekly Reporter.</i>		Walkers, Winsor, & Hanson v. Shaw & Co. ....	70
Beardley v. Giddings .....	78	Wills v. Tozer and Others .....	74
Bolland v. Young .....	67		

## Current Topics.

### The Meeting on the Land Transfer Act.

THE MEETING of the provincial law societies and country solicitors, to be held at Derby on Friday next, to consider the course to be taken by the provincial members of the profession, in conjunction with the Council of the Law Society, for the purpose of preventing any extension of the system of compulsory registration of title being made until there has been a full and independent inquiry as to the working of the system in London, promises to be influential and widely representative. We understand that no fewer than twenty-two provincial law societies have already agreed to send delegates, and that several societies, who are prevented by distance from being officially represented at the meeting, will either send resolutions to be submitted to the meeting or have issued the circulars convening the meeting to their members, in the hope that some of them may be able to be present. It is earnestly hoped that all provincial solicitors who can possibly attend the meeting will make a point of doing so, whether their society is officially represented or not. The matter to be considered is of vital importance to every country practitioner and his clients, and it would seem to be demonstrable that a project for extending the system of officialism and compulsion to the whole of England can be met infinitely better by preventive measures than by opposition after it has been laid before Parliament. The meeting cannot fail to strengthen the hands of the Council of the Law Society and the Associated Provincial Law Societies in dealing with the question.

### The Rule Committee.

THE PRESIDENT of the Liverpool Law Society, in his address at the annual meeting of the society, threw out a suggestion which it is to be hoped will not be lost sight of. He proposed the appointment as assistant secretaries to the Rule Committee of a practising barrister and a practising solicitor, to whom suggestions could from time to time be made upon rules and orders, so that due consideration could be given to any proposals before they are brought before the Rule Committee. The idea appears to be an excellent one, as placing the Rule Committee in touch with the profession, and enabling them to ascertain at once any points in which rules work unjustly or fail to effectually provide for the matters to which they are directed.

## Judicial Dicta.

THERE WAS a diverting little discussion in Court of Appeal No. 2 the other day on judicial dicta. "Too much weight should not be given to interlocutory observations," said Lord Justice COZENS-HARDY to counsel, who quoted a judicial remark made during argument in a case he was citing. "They are chiefly valuable," said Lord Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, "as expressing the judge's opinion while the argument yet lingers in his mind." "Would, then, a considered judgment," it was respectfully submitted, "stand on a different footing in that respect?" "I did not say that," said the learned Lord Justice. We think, however, we could point to a good many judgments which have apparently been delivered after the argument has ceased to linger in the judge's mind.

## "Temporary Receipts."

IN A CASE recently heard before the West Hartlepool County Court a receipt, alleged to have been given to the defendant by the plaintiff, was tendered in evidence. This receipt was unstamped, but it was proposed to shew that it was merely a temporary acknowledgment, and that it was intended that a formal receipt, properly stamped, should be supplied later on. The judge, however, considered that he was not at liberty to accept this explanation, and that the first receipt ought to have been stamped. This ruling appears to be supported by the definition of "receipt" in section 101 of the Stamp Act, 1891, which defines a receipt as any note, memorandum, or writing whereby any money amounting to £2 or upwards, or any bill of exchange or promissory note for the same amount, is acknowledged or expressed to have been received or paid, or whereby any debt of the same amount is acknowledged to have been settled. We believe that provisional receipts are sometimes given pending the clearing of a cheque, but we see no reason why such a receipt should be unstamped. It might be necessary in some cases to give two stamped receipts in a case where the first was lost. The stamping of receipts was formerly attended with much inconvenience to the public, but now that the duty may be denoted by an adhesive stamp, this inconvenience can hardly be said to exist.

## Jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court.

A SUIT which has recently been commenced in the Supreme Court of the United States raises a point of much interest in the constitutional law of the great republic. It is well known that the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction in all suits to which a State is a party; and the action referred to is brought by the State of South Dakota against the State of North Carolina upon bonds which have been repudiated by the defendant State. It is admitted that the title of South Dakota to the bonds has been derived from private holders, and that, under the eleventh amendment of the constitution, a State cannot, without its consent, be sued in its own courts. The holders had, therefore, no remedy, but the Supreme Court has held that South Dakota, claiming under them, is entitled to judgment against North Carolina for the full amount of the bonds. But, although the Court of King's Bench in a similar case might compel a municipal corporation by *mandamus* to levy a rate to pay the amount due, it appears that neither the Government of the United States nor the Supreme Court has any coercive jurisdiction to enforce the payment of the amount due under the judgment, if the Governor of North Carolina refuses to comply with it.

## Elected Judges.

IT IS STATED that it has been decided, upon a referendum in Switzerland, that in future the cantonal judges shall not be appointed by the executive authority but shall be elected by popular vote. This change in the constitution will be regarded with little favour by the legal profession in this country. Our experience of the election of judicial officers has not been large, but it has not encouraged us to resist changes by which the right of electing certain of these officers has been curtailed or abolished. If we turn to the United States, where the Federal judges are, in the larger number of the States, chosen directly by popular suffrage, we find that the change is regretted by many who are most competent to form an opinion. The eminent jurist,

Chancellor KENT, observes (1 Comm. 295) with reference to the change: "Perhaps the most unwise feature in the revised constitution of New York is the election by universal suffrage, and for comparatively short periods, of all judicial officers. The organization of the judicial department is not so essential as the supply of intelligent, learned and honest judges to administer the laws. The danger to be apprehended, as all past history teaches us, in governments resting in all their parts on universal suffrage is the spirit of faction and the influence of active, reckless and unprincipled demagogues controlling and abusing the popular voice for their own selfish purposes. Much more grievous would be such results when applied to the election of judges." The learned author adds, as if anticipating what is now occurring under republican government, "The constitutional provision for making judges elective for short periods by universal suffrage is contagious, and every new constitutional reform or establishment tends that way."

## Extra Rent for Flat.

A CURIOUS point as to the liability of the occupier of a flat for extra rent was recently determined in the Westminster County Court. The action was for £48 0s. 6d. for rent and "attendance." It appeared that the defendant had taken a flat from the plaintiff at a rent of £130 per annum, with 15s. a week "extra rent to include attendance for two persons." The defendant, after sub-letting his flat, gave notice to quit the premises at the Midsummer quarter, and further gave notice that the attendance would not be required after his furniture had been removed. The plaintiff, however, claimed extra rent for the period which elapsed before the premises were re-occupied. The defendant tendered £40 0s. 6d., but this was refused. At the hearing it was contended on behalf of the plaintiff that the weekly payment for attendance was part of the rent, and that whether the defendant was absent or not was immaterial, inasmuch as he must be taken to have been in constructive occupation of the premises. The plaintiff was obliged at all times to maintain servants for the purpose of providing the necessary attendance, and the cost of these servants was not diminished during the absence of the defendant. The deputy judge came to the conclusion that the charge for attendance was not a payment in the nature of rent, and gave judgment accordingly. The relation of the occupier of a flat to his landlord, in a case when it is agreed that food or attendance shall be supplied to him at a fixed rate, in some respects resembles that of a guest in a hotel to his landlord. The guest may retain a room during his absence, but he would not be expected to pay for food and attendance during this period. If the proprietor of the flat wishes to make the occupier liable for attendance during the whole period of his tenancy of the premises, he must either make provision for this liability by express agreement or must arrange for the payment of one undivided sum for rent; this amount to include and cover the cost of collateral charges such as attendance.

## Supplies for Belligerents.

THE QUESTION of contraband seems destined to remain a subject of interest throughout the protracted course of the Russo-Japanese war. Hitherto it has been considered chiefly with a view to the right of belligerents to intercept and condemn neutral ships and their cargoes. During the present week attention has been specially called to the possible breach of neutrality which is involved in the supply of contraband to one or other of the belligerent powers. But so long as this takes place in the way of ordinary trade, it appears that there is nothing of which the other belligerent is entitled to complain. Professor HOLLAND has pointed out, in a letter to the *Times* of the 29th ult., that the supply of contraband to a belligerent involves no breach of neutrality, and that the only effect is that the owner of the contraband forfeits his claim to the protection of his own State should it be captured by the opposing belligerent. But this principle is limited to the supply of goods in the ordinary way of trade. "A government," it is said, "may not in any case sell munitions of war to a belligerent, but its subjects may, provided they sell indifferently to both parties in the war, and provided the transaction is a purely commercial

one, and not done with the intent of assisting in the war, *animo adjuvandi*, but simply for purposes of gain": Wheaton's International Law (4th ed.), p. 612. Of course, if there is anything approaching the fitting out of an armed expedition, different considerations arise, and such conduct is struck at both by international law and by municipal law as embodied in our Foreign Enlistment Act. But such supply of coal and munitions of war as has been going in this country in favour of both Russia and Japan is a matter about which neither is in a position to complain, and the large profit which is thus sometimes obtainable is almost the only piece of luck which in these times comes to shipowners.

#### Taxation by Party Interested.

THE RIGHT to taxation of the costs of the solicitor to an executor or trustee is, as is well known, given by section 39 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, to any "party interested in the property" out of which the costs have been or will be paid, subject to the discretion of the court as to whether taxation is, under the circumstances, proper. Until the recent decision of BUCKLEY, J., in *Re Jones & Everett* (53 W. R. 59) it seems not to have been settled whether a creditor of a deceased person is a person interested in his property within the meaning of this provision, so as to be entitled to apply for taxation of the bill of costs which the executor has paid or is liable to pay. There is a *dictum* of JESSEL, M.R., in *Re Leadbitter* (27 W. R. 267, 10 Ch. D. 388) from which it might be inferred that a creditor is not within the section. "It has always been held," said that learned judge, "that the words 'party interested' mean a party interested under the trust, deed, will, or intestacy," and these words seem to point to a beneficiary who takes directly an interest in the estate, and not to a creditor who comes in irrespective of the will or intestacy. But, according to BUCKLEY, J., the *dictum* of JESSEL, M.R., cannot be found to have been based upon actual decisions, and the case with which he was dealing was not that of a creditor. The application to tax in *Re Leadbitter* was by a bankrupt who had become entitled to the surplus of his estate. Such a case presents no close analogy to that of a creditor who is claiming to be paid out of the estate in a due course of administration, and BUCKLEY, J., held that, since the creditor looks to the estate for payment of his debt, he is a party interested in the property, and is therefore entitled to obtain taxation of the bills of costs made out against the executors.

#### Trustee Companies.

IN THE CASE of *Re Thompson's Settlement* (Times, 1st inst.) SWINFEN EADY, J., has held that there is no legal objection to the appointment of a trustee company to be trustee of a settlement jointly with individual trustees, and that such an appointment may lawfully be made out of court. It seems, indeed, that since a corporation is capable of holding property upon trust, and since it can hold property with an individual in joint tenancy, the possibility of the appointment of a company as trustee must be conceded. For the first proposition SWINFEN EADY, J., referred to *Attorney-General v. Landerfield* (9 Mod. 286), where it was held that a trust was enforceable against a corporation who were devisees in trust, and to *Attorney-General v. St. John's Hospital* (2 D. J. & S. 621), where the same principle was recognized. And the difficulty as to a corporation holding property in joint tenancy has been got rid of by the Bodies Corporate (Joint Tenancy) Act, 1899. But the mere legal possibility does not seem to conclude the question as to a company being suitable for appointment as trustee, and even if such an appointment can properly be made out of court, it by no means follows that it would be made by the court. In the matter of appointing trustees the court imposes stricter rules upon itself than upon donees of the power of appointment, and it must be remembered that at the beginning of the present year JAMES, P., declined to grant probate of a will to a trust company in conjunction with the other executors named in the will (48 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 254). A new departure of this kind, he said, should be made under Legislative sanction. It may be pointed out, too, that trusts exist in the interests of the beneficiaries, and

although a company may see a promising source of revenue in undertaking trust business, yet it is not a legitimate sphere of action, unless such an administration of the estate really subserves the convenience and interest of the persons concerned. From this point of view there can be no doubt that a private trustee is infinitely to be preferred to a company. It is perhaps not a small matter that he is able upon occasion to commit, in Lord LINDLEY's language, judicious breaches of trust. But at any rate he is in a better position than a public company, or a public trustee, can ever be to know the real circumstances of the beneficiaries, and how the testator's or settlor's wishes can best be carried out conformally to the law.

#### Retainer on Behalf of Executors.

IT SEEMS reasonably clear that when several executors or trustees have handed title deeds to a solicitor, with instructions that he shall carry out a particular transaction, one of them alone is not entitled to cancel the joint instructions and require the return of the deeds; and further, that, though such one of the trustees has a beneficial interest which in itself would entitle him to possession of the deeds, he cannot assert this right, while there are overriding trusts or duties in the trustees. These appear to be the principles involved in the case of *Hind v. Sewell* (Times, 26th ult.), though the actual decision did not perhaps cover them. The plaintiff, who was beneficial tenant for life of real estate under a will, was appointed executor and trustee jointly with two other persons—B. and C. C. was abroad, and the plaintiff and B. retained the defendant as their solicitor to obtain probate of the will and to administer the estate. There were debts owing by the testatrix, part of which were paid out of the sale of furniture and part had to be raised out of the land. The plaintiff, alleging that there was delay in the administration, claimed to have the title deeds handed over to him as tenant for life. There was, however, an obvious difficulty in admitting this claim, inasmuch as the assent or conveyance which is necessary under section 3 (1) of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to give effect to the beneficial interest requires the concurrence of all the executors, whether they have proved or not, unless any have disclaimed: *Re Pawley* (48 W. R. 107; 1900, 1 Ch. 58). And where there are debts no such assent or conveyance could properly be made, except subject to a charge for raising the amount of the debts. In the present case, not only had the two acting executors placed the property in the defendant's hands for administration—including, therefore, the raising of money to pay the debts—but, as LAWRENCE, J., held, the executors had agreed to find the amount of the debts by executing a charge on their respective interests under the will. Under these circumstances it was not permissible for one of the executors to withdraw the retainer and require that the deeds should be handed to him before provision had been made for the debts, and LAWRENCE, J., accordingly gave judgment for the defendant.

#### Rating of Railways.

WE READ that, at the hearing at Yarmouth of a rating appeal, brought by the Midland and Great Northern Railway Companies, the recorder took occasion to observe that there were no means of finding out exactly the rule according to which a railway company ought to be assessed. No one will question the accuracy of this statement. The question was raised in the year 1851 in *Reg. v. London and Brighton Railway* (13 Q. B. 313), and other cases, as to the principle on which the poor rate was to be placed on railway companies—whether upon what has been called the mileage principle, that is by treating the whole line of railway, trunk and branches, as one entire subject-matter and the whole rateable value, however constituted, as entire, and then, for the purpose of rating, dividing it among the mixed parishes simply according to the distance which the line passes through each; or upon the ordinary principle of ascertaining the actual rateable value of the land occupied by the company in each parish by the rules which are applicable to any other land occupied by other bodies or persons for other purposes. The Court of Queen's Bench, in their considered judgment, said that they had delayed their decision, not so much from the difficulty of determining the rule of law, as from that which arose on its practical application, and that this difficulty pressed

particularly against what is called the parochial principle. How was it possible by any means in the power of parish authorities to ascertain the particulars of profit and the outgoings, from a comparison between which the rateable value of the land occupied was to be deduced; both profits and outgoings being affected by circumstances spread through the whole line? And in the case of *Reg. v. Great Western Railway Co.* (15 Q. B. 379), decided in the same year, the court said that judgment would not be given during the then present term, as they hoped that before the next term Parliament might intervene and relieve them from the difficult position in which they were placed when called upon to administer the existing law with respect to the rating of railways; and while it was not for them to suggest what should be enacted, they had no doubt that Parliament might lay down a rule applicable to the rating of this novel and important species of property, both simple and equitable, which would effectively put an end to all litigation on the subject. Parliament has, however, from that year to the present day, refused to deal with these questions, and after half a century of costly litigation, the courts are still obliged, in deciding a practical question of valuation, to struggle with technical and artificial rules, with an uneasy consciousness that their decisions cannot always be reconciled with each other.

#### Title to Chattels.

WE ARE told that the general rule of the law of England is that no man can acquire a title to a chattel personal from any one who has himself no title to it except only by sale in market overt. The case of *Miller v. Race*, and the commentary upon it in Smith's Leading Cases, shew that there is an exception to this rule in the case of negotiable instruments, and the case of *Reynolds v. Ashby*, decided last August in the House of Lords, should impress upon our memory that there is another important exception in the case of chattels fixed to land. In *Reynolds v. Ashby* machines were supplied by the owner of them to the lessee of a factory upon the hire-purchase system, the machines to remain the property of the owner till they had been wholly paid for. These machines were affixed to the floor of the factory by bolts and nuts, and it was held that they had been so affixed as to pass to a mortgagee of the premises who had taken possession. The argument that the hirer of the machinery had no title to it until he paid the full price, which he never did, and could not, therefore, give the mortgagee a good title, was wholly disregarded by the House, who adopted the statement of the law by LINDLEY, L.J., in *Gough v. Wood* (1895, 1 Q. B. 713, 719): "If I employ a builder to build me a house, and he does so with bricks which are not his, I apprehend that they become mine, and that their former owner cannot recover them or their value from me." We may take it, therefore, that the title to chattels may be lost by their being affixed to real property by a person who is not the owner of the chattels. This law will appear to many persons to be unsatisfactory, and we should not be surprised if it were at some future period amended by the Legislature.

#### Names of Joint Stock Companies.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE'S suggestion at the banquet of the American Society on Thanksgiving Day, that the name "United States of North America" is of inconvenient length and might be replaced by "Usona," may cause lawyers who are engaged in winding-up cases to ask respectfully whether anything is likely to be done in the matter of curtailing the names of joint stock companies. Anyone who will run his eye through an index of the cases relating to companies will find that some of these titles consist of a string of adjectives or prefixes which, like the Christian names of a monarch, run on without limit. The "Rodry Merthyr Steam and House Coal Colliery Company" is good employment for the memory, but it is easily surpassed by the names of some of our mining and shipping companies, which must of necessity be abbreviated in writing or in conversation as taste may direct. Wherever it is necessary to write these names in full the chances of error are multiplied, and there is good ground for a complaint like that of the manager of a theatre, that the name of one of the performers, "Mr. Bridlington Foidbury," seriously increased the charge for printing the play-bills.

## The Report on the Beck Case.

THIS report will be read with great interest not only by lawyers but by everyone who takes any interest in the administration of justice. It would have been exceedingly difficult to have selected three men who would have formed a better or stronger committee for the purpose of this inquiry than the three who acted. Undoubtedly their names give great weight to the report, and it will be strange if some change in the existing law does not follow as an immediate consequence.

It is satisfactory to read that no substantial blame is laid upon the police for the part they took in the most grievous miscarriage of justice of modern times in this country. A great number of very unfortunate circumstances led to that miscarriage; but the real causes were, first, a mistake in law by the judge who tried the case, and secondly, the mismanagement of some members of the Home Office in relation to the petitions presented by the unhappy victim for inquiry into the circumstances of his conviction. With regard to this second cause we have nothing to say; the committee have recommended a strengthening of the legal staff of the Home Office, and no doubt their recommendations will be followed, and security will be provided that inquiries into the facts of convictions will henceforth be conducted by men who have had some practical experience of the working of the criminal law, and not merely by gentlemen of the Civil Service without legal training.

As to the mistake in law made by the judge, it was certainly an extraordinary one. Several indictments had been presented against Mr. BECK framed on the same depositions. Some of them were for felony, and in these he was charged with having been convicted as Smith in 1877. He was tried, however, upon an indictment for the misdemeanour of obtaining goods by false pretences, which, of course, did not contain an allegation that he had been previously convicted. One of the most important pieces of evidence for the prosecution, however, given before the committing magistrate, and contained in the depositions, was that documents which had undoubtedly been used in the commission of the crime in 1896 were in Mr. BECK's handwriting, and were also in the same handwriting as similar documents made use of by SMITH in 1877 in a similar series of crimes. If this evidence were true, it shewed, first, that Mr. BECK had committed the crime in question; and secondly, that he was the same person who had committed the 1877 crime. Now, apparently it was quite clear, and was admitted on all sides, that the incriminating documents used for the purposes of the crime in 1896 were in the same handwriting as the similar documents of 1877; but did Mr. BECK write them? Expert evidence was given that he did. We know now that he did not. It was the case, both for the Crown and for the prisoner, that the 1896 and the 1877 documents were by the same hand; and the defence was that Mr. BECK was in South America when SMITH was convicted in 1877, and that, therefore, he could not have written the 1877 documents; therefore he was not the author of the 1896 documents; therefore he was not guilty. On the trial of the misdemeanour indictment, however, the 1877 documents were not referred to by the prosecution; expert evidence being given merely affirming that the 1896 documents were in the handwriting of the accused, though disguised. Mr. BECK's counsel then began to cross-examine this expert as to the handwriting of the 1877 documents, to shew that they were by the same hand as the 1896. This was clearly a necessary step in proving his *alibi* with regard to 1877, which, if proved, would imply innocence of the charge being tried. The prosecution, however, objected to the relevancy of this cross-examination, as the 1877 conviction was not in issue on the indictment then being tried, and should not be inquired into, at all events, until after verdict. The Common Serjeant supported this objection, ruling that the question whether or not the prisoner was the man convicted in 1877 was inadmissible, as it related to another and distinct issue. This was the mistake in law which led to the miscarriage. By this ruling the whole defence was shut out. Of course it is a sound general principle that irrelevant matter is inadmissible, but here the matter ruled out was a necessary link in the only defence of any value to the prisoner—a complete answer to the charge if believed. Now, it will not be disputed,

probably, that evidence offered by a prisoner which is relevant to his defence cannot be excluded merely because it is also relevant to some other issue which is not then being tried. On this ground the ruling of the judge was clearly wrong. If one of the felony indictments had then been tried, the defence which the prisoner wished to set up would have been certainly available, and the whole truth might have come out. Unfortunately the prosecution decided to be content with the verdict of guilty that was obtained on the misdemeanour indictment, and not to proceed with the other charges. Therefore, Mr. BECK went into penal servitude without even being able to state his case to a jury. Such a case is lamentable, but where is the remedy?

One great improvement in the law is suggested by way of remedy by the commissioners; that is, to give the High Court power to order a judge to state a case on a point of law. As the law stands, the ruling of any judge—be he chairman of quarter sessions, recorder, or judge of the High Court—is final and conclusive, unless he chooses to state a case on the point for the opinion of the Court for the Consideration of Crown Cases Reserved. This is undoubtedly a hardship, where a man's liberty depends on the decision on a point of law of one man, who is possibly not even a lawyer by training. If, on the other hand, his right to £25 depended on such a decision, he would have large facilities for appealing, and might take his adversary to the House of Lords on the point. This is truly a gross anomaly. It has often been pointed out before, but probably never with such force as in this report. Now that it has been given such prominence, no doubt a remedy will be found, and the High Court will be given power to grant a rule calling upon the Crown to support the ruling impugned, as is suggested in the report.

The commissioners do not carry the matter a step further by recommending what the result ought to be where the High Court decides that a ruling in question was wrong. If in such cases the conviction is merely to be quashed, no doubt there will be a large number of applications to the court, and many guilty persons may escape justice on technical points. To avoid this evil, to a very large extent, it is only necessary to give the court discretion, either to quash the conviction simply or to set it aside and order a new trial. By this means sufficient protection would be afforded to all accused persons where any miscarriage occurred in point of law. But what about a miscarriage on the facts of a case? This opens up a very large question, the great and vexed question of a Court of Criminal Appeal. The commissioners do not recommend the creation of such a court, but they state that they have formed no judgment on the question. But if the anomaly first pointed out in relation to points of law is great, is not the anomaly equally great when we consider miscarriage as matters of fact? What about verdicts against the weight of evidence? They are certainly more common in civil cases than in criminal, because in criminal the benefit of a doubt is given to the accused. At all events, if verdicts against the weight of evidence are common in criminal courts, they usually do injustice by releasing the guilty rather than by convicting the innocent. But that there are cases of the latter kind no one can doubt. The Court of Appeal will, without hesitation, set aside a verdict for a few pounds damages if against the weight of evidence, but no court has power to set aside the verdict of a criminal court on that ground. This state of things will probably not continue. If once the High Court is given power to order a new trial when there has been a mistake in law, it is more than likely that before long, when the idea of retrying criminal cases has become familiar, power will be given to order a new trial also when there has been a miscarriage in fact.

Another anomaly of a very extraordinary nature is attacked in the report; that is, the system of "pardoning" persons for crimes they have never committed. When an innocent man is convicted of a crime, and his innocence is afterwards discovered, there is no power in any tribunal to alter the record which testifies to his conviction. The only thing that can be done is for the Crown to grant a pardon. This has the effect, it is true, of removing any legal results of the conviction, but it is an absurdity and an abuse of language. It is suggested by the commissioners that in such circumstances a conviction should be quashed, on motion by the Attorney-General, and an acquittal entered as of record.

This is a very simple suggestion, and the change in the law will probably be easily made. A man who has been wrongly convicted has a moral right to have his innocence recognized and proclaimed in at least as public a manner as his guilt was falsely proclaimed, and many an innocent man's mind recoils from the absurd "pardon."

We do not believe that miscarriages of justice often occur in criminal courts. An innocent man is very rarely sent to prison. Unhappily, however, they do sometimes happen, and to whatever degree of perfection legal machinery is brought, probably injustice will sometimes be done. It ought, therefore, to be the object of every one concerned to make the machinery as perfect as possible, and to make the chance of so great a calamity happening as small as human ingenuity can make it. If the recommendations contained in this report are carried out, we have no doubt that this great object will be materially assisted.

## Conditions of Forfeiture on Marriage Without Consent.

It is impossible, in reading such a case as *Re Whiting's Settlement* (reported elsewhere), decided this week by the Court of Appeal, not to experience a feeling of regret that the law allows the directions of a deceased settlor so completely to override the interests of the living, but as to the rule of law which recognizes the validity of conditions of forfeiture in the event of marriage without a prescribed consent there can be no doubt, and the Court of Appeal had simply to apply the rule. A settlor had in the year 1868 transferred a sum of about £2,000 to two of the magistrates at Bow-street upon trust to apply the income for the benefit of members of the Metropolitan police. In 1872 the settlor transferred another similar sum upon the same trusts. In 1882 the trust was divided into two funds, one part of which was thenceforth administered by the magistrates at Bow-street, and the other part was administered at Scotland-yard. By a settlement dated the 22nd of January, 1886, the settlor transferred securities of the value of about £31,000 into the names of trustees upon trusts which were varied from time to time by subsequent deeds of revocation, but which were ultimately for payment of the income to the settlor for his life, and after his decease, if his daughter JULIETTE married with certain consents therein required, to the daughter for life, with further trusts in favour of her children. The condition as to marriage directed that if the daughter should marry without the consent of the settlor during his life, or after his death without the consent of his widow and his two sons, or such of them as should at the time be living, then the trusts in favour of the daughter and her children were to cease, and the fund was to go to the magistrates at Bow-street to be applied by them upon trusts similar to those of the trust fund previously established.

The settlor died in 1894, one of the sons in 1897, and the widow in June, 1902. In March, 1902, the daughter applied to the surviving brother for his consent to a proposed marriage of which her mother approved, but the consent was refused. The marriage took place without the brother's consent in August, 1902, the lady being then of the age of thirty-four years. As matters turned out, it appears to have become a matter of indifference to her whether the trusts in her favour were subsisting or not, but in the interest of possible children it was necessary to have the question determined, and proceedings were taken by the trustees of the settlement of January, 1886, to obtain the opinion of the court whether the gift over in the event of the marriage of the daughter without the required consent had taken effect in favour of the magistrates at Bow-street. The matter was argued before the late Mr. Justice BYRNE, but in consequence of his death before giving judgment it had to be argued again—this time before WARRINGTON, J., and that learned judge felt himself bound by the authorities to hold that the condition was valid, and he gave judgment, though with regret, against the claim of the daughter. This result has now been affirmed by the Court of Appeal.

The question of the validity of conditions in restraint of mar-

riage has, it is well known, been the subject of frequent litigation, and it was minutely discussed in the leading case of *Scott v. Tyler* (2 Wh. & T. L. C., 7th ed., p. 535), decided by Lord THURLOW, C., in 1788. Without going into all the subtleties which have been raised on the Roman law, the canon law, and the common law, as to gifts of land and money respectively, and as to gifts upon conditions precedent and conditions subsequent, it is sufficient for the present purpose to say that conditions which tend unduly to restraint of marriage are void, as being against the policy of the law. "In respect," said Lord THURLOW, "of their importing a restraint of marriage they are treated at the same time as unfavourable, and contrary to the common weal and good order of society." But the courts abstained from carrying out this principle in the case of conditions which were only in partial restraint of marriage, and though, in the case of a vested interest without any gift over, the condition was said to be *in terrorem* and was harmless, yet if there was a gift over, such gift took effect upon breach of the condition. "Whatever diversity of opinion," said GRANT, M.R., in *Lloyd v. Branton* (3 Mer. 108, at p. 117), "there may have been with respect to the necessity of a devise over in the case of conditions precedent, I apprehend that, without such a devise, a subsequent condition of forfeiture on marriage without consent has never been enforced. Whatever might be the ground of the decision, it was held that, where the testator only declared that, in case of marriage without consent, the legatee should forfeit what had been before given, but did not say what should become of the legacy, such declaration would remain wholly inoperative."

It being thus clear that the courts viewed conditions in restraint of marriage with disfavour, it might have been thought that a further step would be taken, and that, while conditions restraining marriage without a specified consent might be effective if followed by a gift over, yet that they would be restrained to the minority of the person concerned. It appears to be absurd that a settlor or a testator, whose primary motive is bounty towards a particular person, should be enabled to fetter that person's freedom of marriage after he or she has attained years of maturity. The present case, where the lady was thirty-four, and where the one survivor out of the three persons originally nominated refused his consent, is a very extreme instance of the rule, and it was natural that an attempt should be made to shew that the operation of the condition is restricted to minority. But courts of equity decided to the contrary a hundred years ago and equity in such a case is incapable of growth. In *Scott v. Tyler* (*supra*), indeed, the marriage took place under twenty-one, but in *Dashwood v. Bulkeley* (10 Ves. 230) and *Lloyd v. Branton* (3 Mer. 42) the age of twenty-one had been reached, and the decision was in each case against the daughter. In the former case she attained twenty-one and was married the next day; in the latter she was twenty-six at marriage. But both Lord ELDON, C., and GRANT, M.R., considered that the validity of the condition requiring consent was not open to controversy, although it was not confined to marriage under twenty-one; and if this was so at the beginning of the last century, it is not surprising that the Court of Appeal found it impossible to re-open the question now. VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., referred to the above cases as deciding that, there being a gift over, the condition restraining marriage without consent was not void, notwithstanding that it was not limited to the period of minority, and in the result ROMER and COZENS-HARDY, L.JJ., agreed. There, then, the matter must rest until the unlikely event of the Legislature interfering.

The little duels between the eminent counsel engaged in a case now prominent at the Old Bailey are, says the *St. James's Gazette*, such as one expects from the meeting of men so ready-witted and keenly interested in their respective causes. Such encounters have provoked many a diverting scene as well since as before the days of *Burdell v. Pickwick*. But we do not nowadays go so far as happened when Chief Justice Adams, the American judge, was an advocate. During a trial in which he was engaged, counsel for the other side wrote with chalk upon Adams's hat: "This is the hat of a d—d rascal!" Adams turned gravely to the bench. "I claim the protection of the court," he said. "Brother Sullivan has been stealing my hat, and writing his own name upon it." The effect was so startling as when the future Lord Chancellor Westbury, following an address to the court by a rival, opened his own speech with "After all this noise!"

## Reviews.

### The Year Books.

YEAR BOOKS OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD THE THIRD, YEAR XVIII. Edited and Translated by LUKE OWEN PIKE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury under the Direction of the Master of the Rolls. Eyre & Spottiswoode.

The present volume of the Rolls edition of the Year Books contains rather more than fifty cases of the year 1344, and these include a considerable variety of specimens of real actions, as well as actions of a more general nature, such as debt and deceit. But perhaps the most interesting part of the volume is the portion of the introduction in which Mr. Pike has collected information as to the history of "Parning" or "Parnyng," the first common law Chancellor. He suggests that the "g" should be a "k," and that the real name was the equivalent for Periwinkle, and that the ancestral Periwinkle came over with the Conqueror. But, admitting the speculative nature of the inquiry, Mr. Pike is content to adhere to the conventional "Parning, C.," and as such this energetic judge will probably continue to be known. The epithet is justified by his apparent practice, when as Chancellor he issued a writ to a common law court, of following it up in person to see that justice was properly done. In 1325 he was glad to take from a client a deed securing to himself an annual fee of two marks and a robe secured on the manor of Thurnham in Lancashire, and after his death his widow sued for arrears of the fee. His professional and official career was very rapid. He became King's Serjeant in 1333, and in the years 1340 and 1341 he passed through the offices of puisne justice of the Common Pleas, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and treasurer, to that of Chancellor. He died, while still in the prime of life, in 1343. Mr. Pike's summary of him is that "he had studied history as well as law, and that he loved the sports of the field as well as his books and learning." But, however interesting his career, it is too remote for any decisions of "Parning, C.," to influence the present course of equity. Lord Campbell, indeed, in his Lives of the Lord Chancellors says that he failed to find any trace of any such decisions, though Mr. Pike, who quotes this remark, is able to refer to a report of a case of some importance decided by the Chancellor in 16 Ed. 3.

### Roman Law.

THE DIGEST OF JUSTINIAN. Translated by CHARLES HENRY MONRO, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. VOL. I. Cambridge: At the University Press.

Prof. Monro has embarked upon the ambitious plan of publishing a translation of the entire Digest, and the present volume carries the work as far as the end of the sixth out of the fifty books of which the Digest is composed. Probably most persons who have occasion to refer to the Digest are sufficiently acquainted with Latin to read it in the original, but this fact by no means lessens the utility of a translation. The text frequently presents points of difficulty on which Prof. Monro's aid will be welcome, and for many purposes it will be very convenient to refer in the first instance to the volumes of the translation before having recourse to the original. The translation is printed without notes, except such as are necessary to explain variations in the text. The author expresses the hope that the work may be finished in the course of a few years either by himself or another. When accomplished it will be an important addition to our facilities for studying Roman law.

### New Zealand Company Law.

THE LAW OF LIMITED COMPANIES IN NEW ZEALAND; THE COMPANIES ACT, 1903, AND THE MINING COMPANIES ACTS, 1894 TO 1902, WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES AND FORMS. By CHARLES BRUCE MORISON, Barrister and Solicitor of the Supreme Court of New Zealand. Stevens & Haynes.

This work is primarily intended for New Zealand lawyers, but it will be found useful for occasional reference in this country also. The enterprise of the Colonial Legislature is shown by the fact that it has anticipated our own Parliament in the consolidation of the company statutes, and the whole of the statute law on the subject appears to be now contained in the Companies Act, 1903. To a large extent its provisions are founded on our own statutes, and the explanatory notes are naturally filled with references to the current English cases; but it is noteworthy that in the matter of private companies New Zealand has made a new departure, and Part IV. of the Act of 1903 (ss. 164-172) introduces specific regulations with regard to them. With us the

only legal difference in companies lies in their appealing or not appealing to the public for subscriptions. But the private company now recognized in New Zealand is a company which may consist of any number of members up to twenty-five. Its articles of association need not be registered, but the memorandum of association must shew that the whole of the share capital has been subscribed. A private company is exempted from many of the provisions relating to public companies, but it is debarred from issuing any prospectus inviting subscriptions for shares and it must register all changes in membership within fourteen days. Another novel feature in the New Zealand statute is the provision in section 52 which expressly authorizes, on certain terms, the payment of dividends notwithstanding the loss of capital. The auditors must certify that the remaining assets are sufficient to meet all liabilities except for paid-up capital. Mr. Morison's assistance was procured by the Parliamentary Committee to which the Bill was referred, and his book should furnish some useful hints when once our Legislature again takes up the task of overhauling the Companies Acts.

### Books Received.

County Court Costs: Notes on the Allowance and Taxation of Costs in the County Court (except in Admiralty and Bankruptcy Proceedings). By LOUIS HYDE, Registrar of Stockport County Court. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

Principles and Practices in Matters of and Appertaining to Conveyancing, Intended for the Use of Students and the Profession. By JOHN INDERMAUR, Solicitor. Second Edition. By CHARLES THWAITES, Solicitor. Geo. Barber, Furnival Press.

The Law Relating to the Merchandise Marks Acts, 1887 to 1894. By HENRY MILES FINCH, M.A., LL.M., Barrister-at-Law. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

A Treatise on the Law of Vendor and Purchaser of Real Estate and Chattels Real, intended for the Use of Conveyancers of either Branch of the Profession. By T. CYPRIAN WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law, LL.B., assisted by J. F. ISELIN, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. In Two Volumes. Temporary Second Volume. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

### Correspondence.

#### Fee for Sending Affidavits into Court in Cases Sent for Trial on Affidavits.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In an action in the King's Bench Division, recently tried with a common jury, in which we were concerned, the master had under order 14 directed the action to be set down at once without pleadings (but not in the Short Cause List).

The case, therefore, being tried on the affidavits, it was necessary to have these in court, and on bespeaking the documents we paid £1, the fee demanded.

We subsequently addressed a letter to the senior master pointing out that no fee was required for sending affidavits into court in cases referred to the Short Cause List, and contending that the same practice should operate in all cases sent for trial on the affidavits. We further pointed out that the fee in question was altogether disproportionate to the small service rendered.

We have now received a communication in reply intimating that the imposing of a fee in such cases will in the future be discontinued, and that the fee paid by us will be refunded.

We think the above may be of interest to the profession generally.

CLAPHAM, FITCH & CO.

15, Devonshire-square, Bishopsgate, E.C., Nov. 29.

The *Central Law Journal* is responsible for the following: "What a murderous-looking villain the prisoner is," whispered an old lady to her husband in the court-room. "It makes me afraid to look at him." "Hush!" warned her husband; "that isn't the prisoner; he hasn't been brought in yet." "It isn't? Who is it then?" "It's the judge."

The Lord Chief Justice declared on Thursday, says the *St. James's Gazette*, that the present arrangement in connection with the City of London Cause List was an absurdity. He hoped it would be altered by Act of Parliament. Two or three causes, which were probably settled, were set down in the list, and yet forty special jurors and a large number of common jurors from the City of London were summoned and attended. Besides that, under the present system they did not get London merchants on their Middlesex list, and their presence, in his opinion, was essential. He hoped the Government in their wisdom would consider this, as, with the present Commercial Court, separate London sittings were no longer required.

### New Orders, &c.

#### The Bankruptcy Acts, 1883 and 1890.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACTS, 1883 AND 1890.—GENERAL RULES MADE PURSUANT TO SECTION 127 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

Notice is hereby given that the following Draft Rules have been prepared under the above Act:—

Appeals.—1. No appeal shall be brought—(a) without the leave of the Court, or of the Court of Appeal, from any order made by consent or as to costs only, or from any order relating to property when it is apparent from the proceedings that the money or money's worth involved does not exceed £50; (b) from an omission by the Court to exercise a discretionary power, unless on application made to it the Court shall have refused to exercise such power, in which latter case an appeal from the refusal may be brought.

2. Rule 129 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1886, is hereby annulled, and Rule 1 of these rules is hereby substituted for the said annulled rule, and may be cited amongst the Bankruptcy Rules, 1886, as Rule 129.

Copies of the above Draft Rules may be obtained at the Lord Chancellor's Office, House of Lords.

### Cases of the Week.

#### Court of Appeal.

EARL v. LUBBOCK. No. 1. 22nd Nov.

NEGLIGENCE—CONTRACT TO REPAIR VAN—NEGLIGENCE IN REPAIRING—INJURY TO DRIVER OF VAN—LIABILITY OF REPAIRER.

Appeal from the judgment of a Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Wills and Kennedy, J.J.) affirming the judgment of Judge Emden, sitting at the Lambeth County Court. The action was brought to recover damages for personal injuries caused by the alleged negligence of the defendant. The defendant, who was a master wheelwright, had contracted with Beaufoy & Co. to keep their vans in good and substantial repair for a period of three years. During that period, the wheel of one of the vans needing repair, the defendant's man negligently repaired it, and in consequence the wheel came off while the plaintiff, who was a carman in the employment of Beaufoy & Co., was driving it, and the plaintiff was thrown out and injured. The defendant's servant did not know of the defective condition of the van after he had repaired it. At the trial, at the close of the plaintiff's case, the county court judge gave judgment for the defendant upon the ground that he owed no duty to the plaintiff. The Divisional Court affirmed this judgment. The plaintiff appealed, and it was contended on his behalf that, though the defendant would not be liable to the plaintiff by reason of a mere omission to repair the van, the case was different where he did some act of repair, and in such a case he owed a duty to the person, or one of the class of persons, who to his knowledge would drive the van to use due care in repairing it.

THE COURT (COLLINS, M.R., and STIRLING and MATHEW, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal.

COLLINS, M.R., said that the case was governed by the decision in *Winterbottom v. Wright* (10 M. & W. 109), which was indistinguishable in its circumstances from the present case. There was no contractual relation here between the plaintiff and the defendant. Nor was there the delivery by the defendant to the plaintiff without notice of a dangerous article which, as pointed out by Parke, B., in *Longmeid v. Holliday* (6 Ex. 761), might give rise to a cause of action. The van here was not visibly out of repair in any particular likely to lead to the mischief which happened. The van did not come within the category of dangerous articles to which the principle stated by Parke, B., would apply. Nor did the case come within the principle laid down by Cotton, L.J., and concurred in by Bowen, L.J., in *Heaven v. Pender* (11 Q. B. D. 503, at p. 517). There was therefore no ground of liability in the defendant.

STIRLING, L.J., concurred. In order that the plaintiff should succeed he must bring himself within the proposition laid down by Cotton, L.J., in *Heaven v. Pender*: "Anyone who leaves a dangerous instrument, as a gun, in such a way as to cause danger, or who, without due warning, supplies to others for use an instrument or thing which to his knowledge, from its construction or otherwise, is in such a condition as to cause danger, not necessarily incident to the use of such an instrument or thing, is liable for injury caused to others by reason of his negligent act." In his opinion a van could not be called a dangerous instrument within the first branch of that proposition, nor was there any evidence that the van was, to the knowledge of the defendant, in such a condition as to cause danger, so as to bring the case within the second branch of the proposition. The appeal therefore failed.

MATHEW, L.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, Arthur Powell, K.C., and W. M. Thompson; Montague Leach, K.C., and Lincoln Reed. SOLICITORS, Buchanan & Hurd; Sayle, Carter, & Co.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

Re WHITING'S SETTLEMENT. WHITING v. DE RUTZEN. No. 2. 28th and 29th Nov.

SETTLEMENT—CONDITION—RESTRAINT ON MARRIAGE—MARRIAGE AT ANY TIME WITH CONSENT—GIFT OVER.

This was an appeal from the decision of Warrington, J. The case originally came before the court upon an application by the present

trustees of a voluntary settlement of January, 1886, made by the late Henry Whiting, for the opinion of the court whether a contingent gift over on the marriage of the settlor's daughter without consent had taken effect in favour of the police magistrates at Bow-street, as the trustees of a certain police relief fund established by the settlor. In the year 1868 the settlor had transferred a sum of about £2,000 to two of the magistrates at Bow-street upon trust to apply the income thereof among such of the members of the Metropolitan Police Force as they should consider most deserving of reward for meritorious service. In 1872 the settlor transferred another sum of £2,000 to the magistrates upon the same trust. In 1882 the trust was divided into two funds; one part was thenceforth administered by the magistrates at Bow-street, and the other part was administered by an inspector of police at Scotland-yard. The settlor also subscribed largely to the Metropolitan and City Police Orphanage. By the settlement—the subject of this action—which was dated the 22nd of January, 1886, the settlor transferred securities of the value of about £31,000 into the names of trustees upon trust, the net results of which, as varied from time to time by subsequent deeds of revocation of March, 1887, May, 1891, and December, 1893, were shortly as follows: Upon trust to pay the income to the settlor for his life, and after his decease, if his daughter, Juliette Whiting, married with certain consents therein required, to the daughter for life, and after her death to her children in the usual way. The condition as to the daughter's marriage was as follows: That if the said Juliette Whiting should marry without the consent in writing of the said Henry Whiting during his life, or should after his death and during the lives of the settlor's widow, Henry Paul Whiting and Matthew Noel Whiting (the settlor's sons) marry without the united consent in writing of all three while living, or without the joint consent of the two survivors, or without the consent of the last survivor of them, then and in either of these cases the trusts in favour of Juliette Whiting and her children were to cease and determine as from the date of such marriage, and in this event the trust fund was to go "to the magistrates or magistrate for the time being of the police-court at Bow-street to be invested in any securities of any kind which the said magistrates or magistrate may deem proper, with power to vary the same at their discretion and to distribute the income arising from such investments in the same manner as the income of the police fund established by the said Henry Whiting is distributed." Henry Whiting, the settlor, died in December, 1894, and his son Matthew Noel Whiting in 1897, and his widow died in June, 1902. In March, 1902, Miss Whiting applied to her brother, Henry Paul Whiting, for his consent to her marriage with Sir Alfred Turner. This consent was refused, although Mrs. Whiting had approved of the proposed marriage, and in August, 1902, Miss Whiting married Sir Alfred Turner without consent, the lady then being of the age of thirty-four. The question now raised was whether the gift over to the police magistrates was valid. Circumstances had occurred since the marriage that had made Lady Turner more or less indifferent about, and wholly independent of, the sum settled by this settlement; but as the interests of possible children were affected by the gift over in the events which had happened, the late Byrne, J., when the case was before him in March last, required the question of the validity of this condition in restraint of marriage to be fully argued. The death of that learned judge having prevented his delivering judgment, the case was reargued before Warrington, J., who ultimately came to the conclusion, though with regret, that he was bound by the case of *Lloyd v. Branton* (3 Mer. 108); and he accordingly felt himself obliged to decide that Lady Turner's own interest in the fund and that of any possible children, had been put an end to by her marriage without the consent required by the settlor, and consequently that the fund passed to the police magistrates; and his lordship made a declaration to that effect, and referred the matter to chambers to settle a scheme, which, however, was not to be proceeded with in the event of an appeal. From that decision Lady Turner appealed.

THE COURT (VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, ROMER, and COZENS-HARDY, L.JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J.—I cannot say that this branch of the law is very satisfactory to deal with or easy to weld into one consistent whole. I was told that this branch of the law was partially imported into our system of law from the Roman law by the ecclesiastical courts and then I was told that the Court of Chancery did not entirely adopt the views taken by the ecclesiastical courts. As a matter of history the courts of Chancery had to administer rules of law which they did not always think very just and they were constantly straining the rules by which they yet said they were bound. But by the time of Lord Eldon the rules of law which had been applied to the question whether a particular disposition, made either by a will or by deed *inter vivos*, would not be enforced as being contrary to the public interest or to the policy of the law, had come to be settled. If decisions are found of that date which were based upon the law as settled up to that time, we ought not to depart from those decisions unless there is reason to suppose that those decisions had been questioned in subsequent cases or had not been accepted by conveyancers or by the legal profession generally, as sound decisions. Speaking for myself I cannot regard the present state of the law as desirable. I do not suppose that anyone would regard it as desirable in the interests of the community that gifts should be allowed to be valid which discourage marriage and encourage celibacy. On the other hand I do not suppose that anyone would say that every partial restraint on marriage is an injury to the community and ought to be treated as null and void. Possibly there may be some middle course, and in each case one ought to see whether the particular restraint is reasonable looking at the matter from the point of view of the community. But we are not in a position to deal with this matter according to what might be desirable from the point of view of the community. I think we are bound to follow the decisions of Lord Eldon in *Dashwood v. Lord Bulkeley*

(10 Ves. 230) and of Sir William Grant in *Lloyd v. Branton* (3 Mer. 108). I do not think the court is entitled to consider the question whether it is to the interest of the community that a restraint upon the freedom of marriage should be continued on a woman during the whole of her life, unless such marriage were with the consent of a named person. The only thing we have to consider is whether these cases lay down the law in such a way that the position in the present case is such as can be enforced at law. I think these cases do shew that this condition is valid and can be enforced, and we are bound to give our decision accordingly. In *Lloyd v. Branton* it was held that, there being a condition under which marriage without consent was to operate a forfeiture, and, there being a gift over in the event of the forfeiture, the consent would have to be obtained after the lady had attained twenty-one, and the condition was valid, and the forfeiture must take effect. Now the real ground on which we are asked to reverse the decision of Warrington, J., is that if these settlements are construed so that the consents are required during the whole life of the lady such a condition is unreasonable, and although the restraint is partial and not general, and although there is a gift over, that this court ought to say that the provision for forfeiture is inconsistent with freedom of marriage, and ought to be treated as void. It seems to me that that contention is rendered impossible by the decisions in *Dashwood v. Bulkeley* and *Lloyd v. Branton*. The court is bound by these decisions, and the judgment of Warrington, J., must be affirmed.

ROMER and COZENS-HARDY, L.JJ., delivered judgments to the same effect.—COUNSEL, *Sir E. Clarke, K.C., and Manby; Rowdon, K.C., and Marsham; Mulligan, K.C., and Vaughan Hawkins; R. J. Parker.* SOLICITORS, *Frere, Cholmeley, & Co.; Boxall & Boxall; Solicitor to the Treasury.*

[Reported by J. I. STIRLING, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

### High Court—King's Bench Division.

IMPERIAL GRAND HOTEL COMPANIES (LIM.) v. CHRISTCHURCH GUARDIANS ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE. Div. Ct. 28th Oct; 18th Nov.

RATING LAW—PRACTICE—TIME FOR APPEALING—POOR RELIEF ACT, 1743 (17 Geo. 2, c. 38)—UNION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ACT, 1864 (27 & 28 VICT. c. 39), s. 1—POOR RATE ACT, 1801 (41 Geo. 3, c. 23), s. 8.

This was a case stated by the Recorder of Bournemouth and raised two important points on the law of rating, first as to the meaning of the words "at any time" in section 1 of the Union Assessment Committee Amendment Act, 1864; and secondly, as to whether the recorder, in reducing the assessment appealed against, had power where the rate was payable in two instalments, to confine his decision to that portion of the rate which the appellants had not paid. The following are the facts of the case: The rate was made on the 21st of April, 1903, to provide for expenses incurred before the 31st of March, 1904, and was made payable in two instalments, on the 1st of May and November, 1903. The assessment committee held a meeting for the purpose of hearing objections to the valuation list on the 15th of May, 1903, and at this meeting no objection was taken by the appellants. On the 26th of October, having previously paid the instalment due on the 1st of May, the appellants gave notice of objection to the list, which objection was duly heard by the assessment committee on the 12th of November, when the appellants failed to get relief. Due notice of appeal to quarter sessions was given, and the appeal was heard on the 2nd of January, 1904. The respondents then took the objection that there was no jurisdiction to hear the appeal, as there had been no appeal to the next practicable quarter sessions, as provided by section 4 of the Poor Relief Act, 1743, courts of quarter sessions having been held on the 27th of June and the 27th of October, 1903. The recorder overruled the objection and reduced the assessment, but limited his order to the unpaid instalment of the rate, as he considered the respondents had not taken due steps to appeal against the rate. For the appellants it was contended that, as the recorder had held that the respondent, had not taken steps which they might have taken to object to the rate at an earlier date, they had not complied with the necessity of going to the next practicable sessions. Counsel cited the following cases: *Liverpool Gas Light Co. v. Everton* (19 W. R. 412, L. R. 6 C. P. 414), *R. v. Wiltshire Justices* (4 Q. B. D. 326). For the respondents it was contended that it was only their duty to go to the first sessions after an adverse decision against them by the assessment committee. "At any time" in the Act of 1864 meant at any time during the currency of the rate. On the second point it was contended the decision of the recorder was in conflict with the words of section 8 of the Poor Rate Act, 1801. *Cur. adv. vult.*

The judgment of the COURT (LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., and KENNEDY and RIDLEY, J.J.) was read by

LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., in the course of which it was pointed out that there were numerous authorities deciding that an appeal against a rate must be brought at the earliest possible moment: see *R. v. Suffolk* (4 A. & E. 319) and *R. v. Yorkshire Union* (E. B. & E. 713). Section 1 of the Union Assessment Committee Amendment Act, 1864, provided that no person should be allowed to appeal against a poor rate unless he should have given to the assessment committee notice of the objection against the valuation list and should have failed to obtain relief, and the section further provided that after objection taken at any time in the manner provided by the Act, the committee should hear such objections and have full power to call for and amend the list. The judgment then dealt with the appellants' contention, but decided that while expressing no opinion as to what would be their decision where the whole period for which the rate was made had passed or where there had been unreasonable delay, they were unable to say in this case, in which the objection had been lodged during the currency of the rate the jurisdiction of the recorder was ousted because

the appellant might have taken his objection at one or two earlier meetings of the assessment committee. On the second point they held that the recorder was bound by section 8 of the Poor Rate Act (41 Geo. 3, c. 23), to order repayment in respect of the whole rate. They therefore dismissed the appeal of the assessment committee and allowed that of the hotel companies.—COUNSEL, *Ryde and Francke; Clavell Salter, K.C., and Haydon. SOLICITORS, Lovell, Son, & Pittfield, for Druiitt & Druiitt, Bournemouth; C. F. Ingram, for C. J. Lacey, Bournemouth.*

[Reported by ALAN HOGG, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

**HERMANN v. CHARLESWORTH.** Div. Court. 28th Oct.; 18th Nov.

CONTRACT TO INTRODUCE SUITORS WITH A VIEW TO MARRIAGE—LEGALITY OF CONTRACT.

This was an appeal by the defendant from the judge of the Westminster County Court, and raised the question as to what is a marriage brokerage contract. It appeared from the statement of counsel that the plaintiff in this action, a Miss Herman, called upon the defendant, who owns a paper called *The Matrimonial Post*, having noticed an advertisement in that paper. She agreed after some negotiations to pay him £20, if she got married through his exertions, and she subsequently agreed to pay him £52 in order that she might be introduced to persons with a view to matrimony. She sent a cheque for £52, and the defendant acknowledged it in the following terms: "I have to acknowledge the receipt of £52, less £47 to be returned in nine months should no engagement of marriage take place within that period." The defendant arranged for a large number of introductions, but no marriage took place. The plaintiff then, after five months, took action to recover the £52, and the county court judge gave judgment in her favour, holding that the contract was a marriage brokerage contract, and as the defendant had repudiated it before anything had been done and there was no part performance. For the defendant it was contended that this was not a marriage brokerage contract but a contract to give introductions. It was therefore not illegal. Even if it was, the numerous introductions given by the defendant constituted part performance of the contract. For the plaintiff it was contended there was evidence on which the judge could find that there was a marriage brokerage contract. The contract being illegal, no part performance could take place. Further the introductions were not genuine. It was a case of constructive fraud. *Cur. adv. vult.*

Nov. 18.—The judgment of the COURT (Lord ALVERSTONE, C.J., and KENNEDY and RIDLEY, J.J.), allowing the appeal, was read by

KENNEDY, J.—In the course of which the court, after referring to the facts, held that the transaction was not illegal. The authorities on marriage brokerage were collected in Story's *Equity Jurisprudence* (10th ed.), ss. 260-4, and shewed that the illegal contract was a bargain for pecuniary reward to procure for another in marriage as husband or wife a certain specified person. The business here was essentially different, for there was no undertaking to procure for the plaintiff any particular person as her husband, the only promise was that amongst those whose acquaintance the plaintiff should make through his agency there should be someone with whom the plaintiff would form a matrimonial alliance. The contract was, therefore, not illegal, and the court was not prepared to extend the application of the marriage brokerage decisions.—COUNSEL, *Lush, K.C., and Schiller; Compton Smith. SOLICITORS, Coburn & Co.; A. F. Harvey.*

[Reported by ALAN HOGG, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

## Law Societies.

### The Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool.

The annual general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool was held in the Law Library, 10 Cook-street, Liverpool, on Monday, the 28th inst., the President (Mr. F. MARTON HULL) occupying the chair.

The PRESIDENT, in moving the adoption of the report, said: If the year in which I have enjoyed the honour of occupying the position of president of this society has been somewhat barren of measures affecting the legal profession at large, it has been an eventful one in the annals of our own society. It closed all too soon, in the midst of a busy and useful life, the career of one of our members whose memory will always be held in affectionate regard—I refer to the late John Lawrence. It has also brought distinction to two members of our society, Sir John Gray Hill and Sir Robert A. Hampson, the former being knighted in his capacity as President of the Law Society in connection with the visit of the King and Queen to open the new buildings in Chancery-lane, and the latter received a similar honour on the occasion of the visit of their Majesties to lay the foundation-stone of the new cathedral. It has also witnessed another change in the personnel of our local judges by the appointment of Mr. Pickford, K.C., as Recorder of Liverpool, a selection which met with universal approval, which found expression in the congratulations which were offered to him on his taking his seat in court—proceedings in which I was allowed as your president to take part. There is another matter personal to our own society which I think deserves some further recognition than is given to it in the report. You will see that under the New Charter of the Law Society it is possible for this society to be represented on the Council for a period of years in lieu of the practice of selecting the ex-president for the time being of this society as an *ex-officio* member for a period of twelve months. There can be no doubt that the change is distinctly to the benefit of our society, and the more so by reason of the fact that the committee were successful in inducing Mr. Stevens to be their representative. The society are under great obligation to Mr. Stevens for the time and substance expended by him in attending the various meetings in London of the Council and of sub-committees. The formation of the Faculty of Law within the University of Liverpool

necessitated a revision of the constitution of the Board of Legal Studies, and as one of those who, by virtue of my office, took part in the conference of the constituent bodies by whom the scheme was settled, I desire to recognize the courtesy which the representatives of the university extended to the other constituent bodies—namely, this society and the Law Students' Association, in the settlement of a somewhat complicated matter. Whatever may be the individual opinion as to the wisdom of multiplying universities in this country of ours, it must be admitted that it was a sound policy which dictated the application for a separate charter for the University of Liverpool, as by that means alone has the university acquired an identity which it would never have possessed as a component part of the Victoria University. As solicitors, we are chiefly concerned with the university by reason of the fact that it embraces a faculty of law, through which law students may be admitted to the degree of bachelor of laws. I can well imagine that it may be the ambition of the Liverpool University that their graduates in law shall be admitted to practice of their profession as the result of examination conducted by the university, without the intimation of the final examination of the Law Society. I express no opinion upon that matter beyond remarking that such a state of things would be a strong inducement to local law students, but without that inducement it may still be said that the Liverpool University offers to law students attractions which is not possible for the older universities to offer, in that it is possible for such students concurrently with the period of articles, without any undue strain upon their powers or unduly trespassing upon the time to be given to the practical side of their work in an office to take a degree in law at the university. At the present time the majority of the students attend the course of lectures mainly for the purpose of enabling them to pass the Law Society's examinations, and only about one-third offer themselves for examination for the university degree. It may not therefore be out of place to emphasise the facilities which are offered to the students in this city. With regard to legislation, our concern has rather been for those measures which did not become law than for those which did, many useful Bills having been dropped owing to the state of public business.

### THE COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1903.

A momentary flicker of excitement ranged round the Bill introduced at a late period of the session to amend, or rather to repeal, the County Courts Act, 1903. It will be remembered that this Act comes into operation on the 1st of January, 1905, and that its principal provision is to increase the jurisdiction of the county courts in actions of contract from £50 to £100; subject to this condition that his Majesty is satisfied that due provision has been made for carrying on the business of the courts (in which it is intended to try an action involving a sum exceeding £50) without interference with the ordinary jurisdiction of the court. It had been anticipated that one of the objects of postponing the operation of the Act until the 1st of January, 1905, would have been that the rules might be framed, and other matters arranged so that on the one hand due provision should be made for the conduct of the increased work that would be thrown upon the county courts, and on the other hand, due precaution taken not to interfere with their ordinary business. Instead, however, of any rules being drafted under the Act of 1903, a Bill was late in the session introduced in the House of Lords, the object of which was practically to repeal the Act of 1903 and leave it to an Order in Council to settle the conditions upon which the county courts should meet the increased demands made upon them. The Bill, like many others, being to some extent of a controversial character, was dropped. The result is that the Act of 1903 will come into operation in January next, and apparently will be applicable to all districts unless any conditions are imposed under the proviso to which I have called attention that his Majesty is to be satisfied that all due provision is made for carrying on the business of the court without interfering with its ordinary jurisdiction. Whether this Act is a step forward in law reform as tending to the greater localization of the administration of justice, or as curing the complaints of the law's delays, and the uncertainties as to time in the disposal of actions, is a matter of doubt, but if the original design of county courts is to be so widely departed from it ought to be accompanied by an improved procedure and practice—lower fees and revised costs—and it is worth considering whether in this process of levelling up it would not be desirable at once to make the county courts a branch of the Supreme Court of Judicature, to be called the County Court Division of his Majesty's High Court of Justice. In considering the position of county courts one is reminded that so far as Liverpool is concerned the public possess in the Court of Passage a court which offers many advantages. And it is satisfactory to know that since the new rules came into operation there has been a marked increase in the work of the court. This fact is of interest because this society supported the Liverpool Corporation and other public bodies in their patient struggle to obtain workable rules for the administration of justice in this court.

### THE RULE COMMITTEE.

This reference to rules and orders leads me to suggest that the Law Society and the various provincial law societies might well turn their attention to obtaining a revision of the rules and orders of the High Court. At present, even with the help of what is familiarly known as "The White Book," which may also be termed the "Bradshaw" of our profession, it is difficult to disentangle the mass of material which makes up the rules and orders. It may be that it is not possible to dispense with any of them, but if a small committee composed of practising lawyers of either branch of the profession could recommend any material reduction in bulk it would be beneficial to the profession and to suitors alike. Under any circumstances, I think another step in the right direction would be the appointment as assistant secretaries to the Rule Committee of one practising barrister.

and one practising solicitor, to whom suggestions could from time to time be made upon rules and orders, so that due consideration may be given to any proposals before they are brought before the Rule Committee of judges. In making this suggestion I am not unmindful of the fact that the Lord Chancellor's secretary is also secretary of the Rule Committee, and we in Liverpool have ample reason for acknowledging the consideration given by him to the suggestions made from time to time by this society, nor am I unmindful of the fact that an earnest attempt is being made to increase the representation of our branch of the profession on the Rule Committee by the permanent appointment of a solicitor practising in the provinces, but having regard to the rare intervals at which the Rule Committee meet and to the fact that the arduous duties of its members in other directions make it impossible for them to give proper time and attention to the consideration of rules and orders, I do not think the latter suggestion of increasing our representation on the Rule Committee, good and desirable though it is, will be a sufficient solution of the difficulty.

#### THE LICENSING ACT, 1904.

Our report contains a reference to another Act of Parliament of the present session, in which our profession is interested—namely, the Licensing Act, 1904. Since our report was printed steps have been taken by the committee in conjunction with all the other law societies in the county for the purpose of insuring that the right of audience by solicitors before the committee of quarter sessions shall be provided for in the rules to be framed under the Act. In county boroughs, the rights of solicitors will not be affected by the Act, but they may be in the country districts outside the borough where licensing business will be dealt with by quarter sessions; with the result that this anomaly will exist—namely, while a solicitor is permitted to appear before the justices in county boroughs, he may not be permitted the like right outside the borough before the committee of quarter sessions. This anomaly is accentuated by the fact that the number of licensed premises in the county boroughs of Lancashire is 7,532 as compared with 4,439 in the country, and similarly the amount of compensation which can be levied each year from these houses is £124,641 in county boroughs, as against £61,424 in the country districts. The action adopted in Lancashire has subsequently been confirmed by the Associated Provincial Law Societies as involving a question of importance not only to the profession, but to the wide range of persons entitled to be represented in licensing matters.

I think that our society may be congratulated upon the position which it occupies, and I think I may claim for the committee that they are ever ready to identify themselves with any matters which call for attention as affecting public or professional interests, and I join with my predecessors in strongly advocating that every member of the profession should also be a member of the Law Society. Compulsion is a word that we do not utter lightly in this country, but if public spirit and private interest are not sufficient to impel solicitors to seek admission into the ranks of the Law Society, it may be worth considering whether the society should not seek power to make membership compulsory. I cannot conclude these somewhat discursive remarks without tendering to the members of the committee, and especially to our excellent honorary secretary, my sincere thanks for much valuable assistance and many acts of kindness.

Mr. ARNOLD J. CLEAVE seconded the motion.

Sir JOHN GRAY HILL, in supporting, expressed regret that, owing to the action of certain obstructionists in Parliament, the Solicitors Bill was not passed into law. It was most desirable for the purity of the profession and for the protection of the public that the Bill should become law.

The report and balance-sheet was then adopted.

On the motion of Mr. SEPTIMUS CASTLE, seconded by Mr. BELLINGER, thanks were tendered to the President for his address, and on the proposition of Mr. F. GREGORY, seconded by Mr. H. H. GIBBONS, the officers and committee were thanked for their services during the past year.

The following are extracts from the report of the committee:—

**Members.** The society now consists of 412 members. The number of barristers and others, not being members, who subscribe to the library is 55. During the past year 14 new members have been elected. During the same period eight members, in addition to the deceased members, have ceased to belong to the society. Two members of the society are to be heartily congratulated on the honour conferred upon them by his Majesty the King—Sir John Gray Hill received the honour of Knighthood in his capacity of President of the Law Society in connection with the visit of the King and Queen to open the new buildings of the Law Society in Chancery-lane—and Sir Robert A. Hampson, as Lord Mayor of Liverpool, received a similar honour upon the occasion of the visit of their Majesties to lay the foundation-stone of the new cathedral.

**Legal Education.**—The Dean of the Faculty of Law of the University of Liverpool reports a most successful year, both upon the University side and upon the purely professional side of the work of the faculty. The number of courses delivered during the past session has been thirty, as compared with twenty in 1902-3, and there is also a gratifying increase in the number of class entries as compared with the previous session. The Timpon Martin and Atkinson Gold Medals and the Enoch Harvey Prize for the year 1903 were all gained by Mr. Wilson Bell, LL.B., who served his articles with Mr. G. P. Mason, of Messrs. Mason, Grierson, & Martin, of this city. Mr. Bell was placed in the first class at the Honours Examination held in June, 1903. During the year that Mr. H. D. Bateson was an extraordinary member of the Council of the Law Society, he took a leading part in the deliberations of the Legal Education Committee, and

he has this year been selected by the council as one of five provincial representatives on the Legal Education Committee of that body.

**Liverpool Board of Legal Studies.**—In the report of last year, reference was made to the scheme for the re-constitution of the Liverpool Board of Legal Studies in consequence of the formation of a faculty of law in connection with the University of Liverpool, and to the fact that certain clauses in the scheme designed to secure to the board an effective voice in the selection of the subjects on which lectures would be delivered and classes held, and in the appointment of lecturers and professors, did not meet with the approval of the representatives of the University on the faculty. At the suggestion of the council of the Liverpool University, a conference of representatives of the constituent bodies was held to discuss these clauses, with the result that an agreement was arrived at by which the board were given effective control in respect of the matters above referred to.

**Law Society's Hall—Room for Use of Country Members.**—It may be of interest to the members of the profession in Liverpool to know that a room is available at the Law Society's buildings (entrances Chancery-lane and Bell-yard) for the use of members of the society for the purpose of consultation, free of charge.

**Constitution of the Rule Committee.**—As reported in the last annual report, representations were made to the Lord Chancellor with a view of obtaining an alteration in the representation of the solicitor branch of the profession on the Rule Committee under which the representative of the Law Society would be appointed for a fixed term of years, and in addition a second representative would be added to represent provincial practitioners. In June last a deputation from the Associated Provincial Law Societies, consisting of Mr. Marshall, of Leeds, and Mr. Mather and Mr. Morton, of this society, waited upon the Lord Chancellor, who stated that, without expressing a definite opinion, he was not unfavourably disposed to the suggestion.

**Licensing Act, 1904.**—This Act, which comes into operation on the 1st of January next, is an amendment of the Licensing Acts, 1828-1902, "in respect to the extinction of licences and the grant of new licences." So far as solicitors are concerned, the chief point in the Act is the transfer in certain cases of a part of the jurisdiction of licensing justices to a committee of quarter sessions. This apparently will not affect Liverpool or any other county borough, as for this purpose the whole body of licensing justices takes the place of the quarter sessions committee. But the area of the society comprises many petty sessional districts, and in these an important part of licensing business, now conducted by solicitors, is transferred from the justices to a committee of quarter sessions. The question, therefore, becomes of importance whether audience should be allowed to solicitors before such a committee, and during the progress of the Bill through the House of Commons representations were made to the Law Society, with the result that an amendment was moved providing that any person entitled to be heard by such committee might be heard by counsel or solicitor on his behalf. This was rejected on a division, and the matter left to be decided by quarter sessions and the Secretary of State by rules. By section 5 of the Act, quarter sessions are to make rules to be approved by the Secretary of State governing the mode of appointment of committees, and—so far as is not otherwise provided for—the procedure of those committees. The committee understand that in all probability the question of solicitors' audience will be dealt with by the rules in question, and they have accordingly communicated with the clerks to the Lancashire and Cheshire County Councils, asking that an opportunity should be afforded them of considering the draft rules and offering suggestions, which request has been granted. They have also communicated with the other law societies of Lancashire with the view of combined action being taken in the matter.

**Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, 1903.**—At the request of the committee, the Secretary of State courteously afforded them an opportunity of considering an early draft of the rules which were to be made under section 2 of the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, 1903. In the original draft the selection of counsel was with the clerk of the peace, but the committee suggested that it should be left with the solicitor who acted in the case, and in the rules as passed effect has been given to this suggestion. The committee also suggested that in addition to the statutory caution a statement should be addressed to the prisoner informing him under what circumstances he would be entitled to legal assistance at the public expense, but this suggestion was not adopted. The recent remarks of Mr. Justice Wills in charging the grand juries of Wiltshire and Dorsetshire emphasise the necessity of steps being taken in this direction. The committee are in further communication with the Secretary of State on the subject. In connection with this Act the clerk of the peace for Cheshire invited the society to furnish him with the names of the solicitors practising in the county of Chester, who being members of the society were willing to undertake the defence of poor prisoners under the Act. A letter was accordingly addressed to the members of the society practising in Cheshire, and the names of those who had intimated their desire to be placed on the list were communicated to the clerk of the peace. Experience of the working of this Act shows that the maximum fees allowed to counsel and solicitors are in many cases totally inadequate, and the committee are of opinion that an amendment of the rules should be sought for giving the court or judge at the trial a wider discretion in the allowance of fees in difficult cases.

In the course of a speech at Easby, in Kent, on the 24th ult., Mr. Akers-Douglas, the Home Secretary, referred to the withdrawal of the Aliens Bill last session, and said it was his intention to bring the Bill forward again, or a Bill of similar character, and to pass it in the coming session.

## Law Students' Journal.

### The Law Society.

Sir Albert Rollet, M.P., has kindly undertaken to deliver an address to students on "The Solicitor as Advocate," on Wednesday, the 7th of December, at 5.30 p.m., at the Law Society's Hall. Members of the profession and the public will be welcomed.

We are informed that the students attending the lectures and classes of the society's new system of education were very successful at the November examinations. Twenty students entered for the Final, and of these seventeen were successful; twenty-four entered for the Intermediate, and nineteen were successful, three being placed in the first class. The Final Honours List has not yet been published.

An interesting experiment is to be tried in the form of a students' common room for the convenience of students attending the society's lectures and classes. These are usually held in the late afternoon or evening; and it is felt desirable that there should be some place in which the students can gather together for social intercourse either before or after their work. The details of the scheme are now being settled, and it is hoped that the room may be ready for occupation very shortly.

### INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

The following candidates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Intermediate Examination held on the 9th of November, 1904:

#### FIRST CLASS.

Adderley, Harry Edward  
 Andrews, Edward Joseph  
 Armstrong, William Pallett  
 Bell, Herbert George, M.A. (Camb.),  
 B.A. (Lond.)  
 Bla-kw-ll, Herbert Montague  
 Cahill, Michael Frederick  
 Case, William Alfred James  
 Clark, Francis Stafford  
 Clark, William Scott  
 Collier, James Henry  
 Cooksey, Thomas Owen  
 Cope, Junius Minett  
 Courtenay, Edwin George Thomas  
 Davies, Reginald Charles  
 Downiog, Harold Corbett, B.A.  
 (Oxon.)  
 Duffey, George Gavan  
 Ebsworth, William  
 Ellis, Bernard Henry  
 Farrington, Ernest  
 Finn, David Adrian  
 Forman, Arthur Temple, B.A.  
 (Oxon.)  
 Foster, Hugh Matheson  
 Gee, Randolph  
 Heynes, Dudley Hugo  
 Hobson, Neville  
 Hollis, Denzil, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Isherwood, Frederick Thomas Vin-  
 cent, B.Sc. (Lond.)  
 Jackson, Charles Joseph  
 Jackson, Edward Challenger  
 James, Percy Watkins  
 Jeans, Charles Ewart  
 Johnson, Coningsby Samuel  
 Lewis, Joseph  
 McGahey, Michael John  
 McNair, Arnold Duncan  
 Munday, Ralph  
 Oerton, Thomas  
 Pawlyn, James Hawkins  
 Pickering, Stephen Harold  
 Ponsford, Arthur Cuthbertson  
 Pritchard, John James  
 Quilliam, William Henry Billal  
 Reid, Robert James  
 Richardson, Russell  
 Ritson, John George  
 Robinson, Alfred  
 Smith, William  
 Stirling, Hugh William  
 Strutt, Raymond Hugh  
 Timperley, Percy  
 Turner, Cyril  
 Tyacke, Charles Noel Walker  
 Walster, Alfred Ernest  
 Watts, Edwin Littlelike  
 Wells, Charles Alexander, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Williams, Guy  
 Williams, Henry William Davies  
 Williams, John Griffith

Williamson, Robert Chapman  
 Wilson, Reginald Arthur

#### PASSED.

Adams, Gerald Day  
 Addison, Archibald William Norman  
 Almack, Richard  
 Anderson, Reginald  
 Ashworth, Francis Edward  
 Back, Horace Aubrey, B.A. (Oxon.)  
 Baker, Cecil Leacroft Watkins  
 Bannehr, Harold James Thomas  
 Barratt, Frederick  
 Barratt, Gilbert  
 Batchelor, Spencer Martin Eyckholt  
 Beattie, Henry Musk  
 Behn, George Alfred Oswald  
 Binne, Clement Stanley  
 Blockley, Edgar Arthur  
 Blyton, Edmund Van Houtte  
 Booth, Vincent Strawson  
 Boulter, Christopher Steele  
 Bray, Cecil Francis  
 Bretherton, Percival James  
 Bright, Archibald Viccars  
 Brooke-Wynn, Reginald Charles  
 Brown, Hamilton Linford  
 Brown, William Linford  
 Brumfit, Clifford  
 Bryant, Sydney  
 Burt, Arthur  
 Carr, Jeffery Grey  
 Carter, Harry Osborne  
 Carter, Isidore Onslow Goodricke  
 Chapman, Albert Lacy  
 Chippindale, Oswald  
 Chubb, James William Rooke  
 Churchill, Ernest Frank  
 Clappen, Allan Victor  
 Clayton, Frank  
 Cleminson, Henry William  
 Coles, Royes Stanley  
 Cook, Percy Mellows  
 Cooke, David George  
 Cooney, John Fancourt  
 Cope-Proctor, Edward Garraway  
 Cottam, Albert  
 Coventry, Joseph Robinson  
 Cowley, George Hamilton Ivens  
 Craze, Francis  
 Crompton, William Earle  
 Crompton, William Wilson  
 Dadd, Ralph  
 Dale, Alwyne Percy, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Daphne, Frank  
 Dawes, Albert Henry  
 Dixon, Frederick Mostyn Bambridge  
 Dixon, Geoffrey  
 Dodsworth, Benjamin, B.A. (Oxon.)  
 Dunsford, Reginald Martin  
 Eaves, Frederick  
 Eddowes, William Rhodes  
 Edmunds, Thomas John  
 Edridge, Thomas Richard  
 Ellis, Henry Ratcliffe

Emley, Maurice Woodman  
 Evans, Cyril Henry Shenton  
 Everard, Hugh Martin  
 Eves, Harold  
 Faulkner, Bertram, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Fenoughty, James William  
 Fowler, Eric Francis Tierney  
 Frere, Edgar, B.A. (Oxon.)  
 Friend, Leonard Michael  
 Fuller, Philip Reginald, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Furniss, Frank  
 Gard, Stephen Alfred  
 Gibson, Ernest Basil  
 Goldsworthy, Augustus William  
 Gordon, Stephen Jefferson  
 Green, David Johnston  
 Grey, Harry Dixon  
 Gribble, Henry John Carew  
 Griffiths, David Williams  
 Guthrie, William, B.A. (Durham)  
 Hall, Arthur Anderson  
 Hatfield, Laurence Victor  
 Heap, Harold Schofield  
 Helmer, Roy Helmerow  
 Hemingway, Edward Cecil  
 Henderson, Henry Wallace  
 Higham, Norman Marshall  
 Hinchcliffe, Thomas Henry  
 Hinds, James Oswald  
 Hirst, Gerald Vardy  
 Hodges, William Langham  
 Hoffmann, Cecil Duncan, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Holden, Hugh Shuttleworth  
 Horner, John Gerard  
 Howson, Thomas Aspdin  
 Hutton, Arthur Miles  
 Izard, Walter Wallace  
 Jackson, Arthur Graham  
 Jackson, Arthur Harding  
 James, Alexander Young  
 Jameson, Harvey, B.A. (Oxon.)  
 Jenkins, George Kirkhouse  
 Johnson, George  
 Johnson, Sydney Harcourt  
 Johnson, William Burgess  
 Jones, John Bethell  
 Jones, Richard Tudor  
 Jones, William Herbert  
 Kelly, Norman Edward, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Kemp, Cecil Herbert  
 King, Cyril Lander  
 Kingcombe, Archibald William  
 Kirk, William  
 Kitchen, William Croysdale  
 Knoyle, William Martin  
 Lake, Norman John  
 Layton, Bernard Cecil  
 Layton, Hugh Carden  
 Lethbridge, George Charles  
 Levy, Hyam Moses  
 Levy, Lewis, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Lewis, Gerald Patterson  
 Lewis, Thomas John  
 Lewis, William Herbert  
 Lindsey, Samuel Thomas  
 Liversage, John Robert  
 Lloyd, John George Frederick  
 Longcroft, Charles Edward Beare  
 MacIlvenna, John  
 Mackay, Donald Paley  
 Mawdesley, Albert Joseph  
 Merrick, Laurence Bruce  
 Middleditch, Benjamin  
 Milburn, Laurance Edward, B.A.  
 (Oxon.)  
 Milburn, William Martin  
 Milson, Algernon Charles  
 Minor, Hugo Walford  
 Mitchell, Harold Charles Barnes  
 Morgan, Charles Herbert  
 Morris, Esau Glyn  
 Morton, Philip Howard  
 Mote, Lionel Gordon  
 Moxon, William Heald  
 Nelson, Richard Albany, B.A., LL.B.  
 (Camb.)  
 Newton, Reginald Arthur  
 Nicholl, Charles Rice Iltyd, B.A.  
 (Oxon.)

Noble, John  
 Noon, Percy Harold  
 Norrington, George  
 O'Connor, Arthur Rupert  
 Ormerod, George Riley  
 Owen, Cecil Clarkson  
 Palmer, Charles Courtney  
 Parker, George Leslie  
 Parsons, Frederick Gordon  
 Pashley, Ross Pitcher  
 Pattison, Walter Edward Luard  
 Penny, Thomas Edward  
 Pickup, Henry Arthur  
 Pickup, Thomas William  
 Pilbrow, Albert Horace  
 Platts, Walter Leslie  
 Pomeroy, Sidney Howard  
 Porter, Gwyn Conway  
 Pratten, John Albert Albra  
 Price, Thomas Ralph Plumer  
 Pritchard, Ion Buchanan, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Reader, Harold Cyprian  
 Redman, Henry Gordon  
 Rees, David Kenwyn  
 Richardson, John George  
 Richardson, John Watson, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Roberts, Arthur Trelawney Cairns  
 Roberts, John Kerfoot  
 Roberts, Walter  
 Roberts-Jones, Morley  
 Robinson, Frederick Alan  
 Robinson, George  
 Robinson, Norman Huntly  
 Russ, Charles Andrew Sutherland  
 Ruston, Cecil Harold Sowerby  
 Salmon, George Harry  
 Sanders, Arthur Henry  
 Schooling, Bernard Albert  
 Scott, William McDougall Wood-  
 ward, B.A. (Oxon.)  
 Sell, Wilfred Hazell, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Shapley, Walter Thomas  
 Shepley-Taylor, William Leonard  
 Sherry, Blake Gordon  
 Smith, Crowther  
 Smith, Vivian Arthur  
 Spencer, Edwyn Luke  
 Stevenson, George Charles Burton  
 Stewart, Charles  
 Still, Francis Churchill  
 Stokes, Elliott Seymour  
 Stokoe, Harry  
 Styring, Allan Hovey  
 Sutton, Charles George  
 Sweet-Escott, Horace Hay  
 Symonds, John Ashby, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Taylor, Charles Paul, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Teebay, Herbert Joseph  
 Thomas, Samuel John Ball  
 Thomas, William Edward  
 Thompson, John Cecil Carter, B.A.  
 (Camb.)  
 Thorpe, John William  
 Toller, Edward Northcote  
 Tomkins, Frank Savill  
 Tompson, George Edward  
 Toovey, Arthur Wilfrid  
 Tuff, Bertram  
 Turner, Henry Elliot  
 Wall, Geoffrey Creswell  
 Walton, Charles Stanley  
 Warr, George Geoffrey, B.A. (Oxon.)  
 Watling, Henry Richard  
 Watts, Henry Arthur Dixon  
 Watts, Isaac Seymour  
 Whitton, Walter James  
 Wigton, Nigel Stuart  
 Wilkins, Robert Bird Manning  
 Wilkinson, George Edward, B.A.  
 (Oxon.)  
 Williams, Hugh Meyrick  
 Williams, Samuel Roger Thomas  
 Auton Montagu  
 Williams, Thomas  
 Willis, Guy Cooper  
 Wilson, Arthur Lewis, B.A. (Camb.)  
 Wilson, Swiaburn Gibson  
 Wilson, Thomas  
 Wing, Arthur  
 Wynne, James  
 Zambra, Nelson, B.A. (Camb.)

## FINAL EXAMINATION.

The following candidates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Final Examination held on the 7th and 8th of November, 1904:

Andrew, Francis Atherley Winn	King, Thomas Freeman
Armstrong, John Henry Nicholas,	Knight, Joseph
M.A. (Camb.)	Lambert, Frederick
Bache, Charles Sidney	Lambert, Henry Hewitt
Ball, Frank Leslie	Lasemann, John Adolph
Barford, Herbert Valentine	Lawrence, William Edward
Barnley, George William Wynne	Lawson, Harold Harry
Barrett, Frank	Lee-Roberts, George Bennett
Berry, Alfred William	Lever, Percy Fogg, B.A., LL.B.
Bonnor, Gerard Leigh Dempster	(Camb.)
Brabazon, Charles Pierpoint, B.A.	Lewis, Christopher Sothern, M.A.,
(Oxon.)	LL.B. (Camb.)
Bradford, Charles Cyril, B.A.	Lloyd, Thomas Henry
(Oxon.)	Marsden, George William
Bullpitt, James	Martin, John Lancelot
Campbell, Archibald Kenneth	Matthews, Thomas Alfred
Charley, Herbert	Maude, Robert Cecil
Christie, Herbert James	Meaby, Kenneth George Tweedale
Clare, Frank Conquest	Milroy, Edward Andrew Wallace,
Coleman, Arthur Mainwaring	M.A., B.C.L. (Oxon.)
Cresswell, Edward Arthur	Morgan, William Richard
Cruickbank, Robert Scott, B.A.	Morrison, Douglas Charles Adey,
(Camb.)	B.A., LL.B. (Camb.)
Darke, Hugh Cuff	Nelson, Basil
Davey, Horace	Norris, Harold Edward Francis
Davies, Evan John	Norris, William
Davis, Edward	Owen, Leslie
Done, Neville Savage	Page, William
Donne, William Ralph	Parr, Cecil Robert Morrall
Durrant, Reginald Bickersteth, B.A.	Peele, Joshua John
(Camb.)	Ponsford, George
Edwards, Awdry Molesworth	Powell, Charles Noel
Edwards, Basil Wynn	Priestley, Jethro Scowcroft
Edwards, Harris	Pullon, John Robertson
Everett, Alexander Fraser, B.A.	Randell, Thomas Jones
(Oxon.)	Richards, Sydney Charles
Farmer, George Henry	Ritchie, William Thackeray Denis,
Farrell, Bede	B.A. (Oxon.)
Fieldhouse, Richard Edward	Roberts, Elford Harding
Finch, John Douglas, B.A. (Camb.)	Robertson, Malcolm Gordon, B.A.
Footner, Foster Lake	(Durham)
Foulston, Frederick	Robinson, Gleeson Edward
Francis, Henry	Robinson, Harold
Freeley, Thomas Ronald	Roderick, Thomas Malet Vaughan
Freeman, Robert Bingle	Rodwell, Denham Edgar
Gadban, Victor John, B.A. (Oxon.)	Royle, Ernest Rupert
Gamble, Walter	Sadler, Bernard Charles
Gething, Robert Eills, B.A. (Oxon.)	Sedgwick, John Robinson, B.A.
Gillett, Hugh Vernon, B.A. (Oxon.)	(Oxon.)
Golding, Charles Spencer	Seymour, Leofwine Robert Gurth
Goodman, Richard	Stewart Chambers
Gooden, Reginald Ollivant	Sheffield, Lancelot Hull, B.A.
Gowing, James Joseph Warden	(Oxon.)
Grant, Ronald Carey	Sherwood, Ernest Tress
Gray, Colin	Simmons, Joseph Bruce
Gray, James	Skinner, Edward James
Griffiths, David Llewellyn	Smith, George Edward
Groves, Joseph	Stacey John Atherford
Harris, Reginald	Standley, Lionel
Harrison, Eustace James, B.A.	Stephenson, Paul
(Camb.)	Stratton, Maurice
Hartopp, Ronald Arthur Charles	Summerhays, Reginald Sherriff
Craddock	Sunderland-Taylor, Ralf
Hawkins, Alan George, B.A. (Camb.)	Taylor, Ferdinand Hall, B.A. (Oxon.)
Hellawell, Frank Arthur	Taylor, Ronald George
Henman, William Whitefield, B.A.	Thomas, Lewis Meyrick
(Camb.)	Thomas, William George
Hey, William Leonard	Thompson, Kenneth Herbert
Hicks, Vyvyan George Hooper	Tijou, Charles Kiddy, B.A. (Camb.)
Higgins, Edward	Trevelan, Herbert George
Hind, William Blakestone	Tryon, Basil Frederick Tuckfield
Holden, Ralph Ainsworth	Vaughan, Frederic Henry, B.A.
Hooper, William Graham	(Oxon.)
Houlster, Alec Guy	Wain, George William
Houlston, Edward Bicknell	Walmisley, Elyard Atherstone
Jenkyn, Cyril Osborn	Walton, Henry Featherstone
Jennings, Edwin	Wardle, Robert Fox
Je-sup, Thomas Henry	White, Sidney Linthorne
Jones, Cyril Oswald, B.A. (Royal	Williams, Edward
Univ., Ireland)	Williams, Hugh
Jones, Henry Gilman	Womersley, Henry
Jones, Reginald Thomas Pryce, B.A.	Wood, Trevor Ley Codner, LL.B.
(Camb.)	(Camb.)
Jones, Walter Owen, B.A. (Wales)	Woolf, Louis Sydney
Jose, Christopher Henry, B.A.	Worthington, John Morton
(Camb.)	Wynne, William Giffard
Kimber, Thomas	Young, Byron William Douglas,
King, Edgar Blake	B.A. (Oxon.)

## Law Students' Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—Nov. 29.—Chairman, Mr. W. E. Singleton.—The subject for debate was: "That the law as to rights of light as laid down by the House of Lords in the case of *Colls v. Home and Colonial Stores (Limited)* was not in accord with the better authorities and requires alteration by Parliament." Mr. F. J. A. Leggett opened in the affirmative. Mr. A. B. Russell opened in the negative; Mr. J. D. Young seconded in the negative. The following also spoke: Messrs. Pleadwell, Scott-Duckers, Walker, Ames, Henderson, C. M. Knowles, Lake, Blagdon, Anderson, Knowles. The chairman having summed up, the motion was lost by twenty-eight votes. There were over forty members and visitors present.

## Legal News.

## Appointments.

Mr. JAMES JARDINE, K.C., and Mr. R. F. MACSWINNEY, barrister-at-law, have been elected Benchers of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple.

Mr. WARMINGTON, K.C., Chairman of the Bar Council, has been elected Treasurer of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple for the ensuing year in succession to Mr. Alexander Dauney.

Judge BOMPAS, K.C., has been elected Treasurer of the Inner Temple for the ensuing year, in succession to Mr. Justice Grantham.

Mr. J. SCOTT FOX, K.C., has been elected a Bencher of the Inner Temple.

## Changes in Partnerships.

## Dissolutions.

JOHN COOPER and JOHN FREDERICK COOPER, solicitors (Cooper & Son), Henley-on-Thames. Oct. 24. The said John Frederick Cooper will continue to carry on the business under the style of Cooper & Son. [Gazette, Nov. 25.]

## General.

The report of Dr. R. W. Branthwaite, the inspector under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, for the year 1903 has just been issued. It states that the number of local authorities taking advantage of the Act is steadily increasing, but the attitude of the judicial authorities is rather varied, and some courts shew a marked reluctance to commit, though few, if any, are free from the "recidivist habitual." During the year 1903 298 inebriates were committed, 75 in the first class, 223 in the second. The total number exceeded by 20 that of any previous year, and as usual there was an enormous excess of female over male committals. Not more than 50 per cent. of the committals were for the full three years sentence, and it is thought that better results would be obtained if longer sentences were given.

Boarding-house keepers are, says the *Daily Mail*, greatly agitated by a decision given Judge Woodfall at the Westminster County Court, on Wednesday, from which it seems that those who supply board and residence—apart from hotel and inn keepers—are powerless to protect themselves against unpaid bills by detaining the boxes of defaulting customers. The case was that of *Garnham v. Hamilton*. Mr. Garnham claimed £50 damages against Mr. Hamilton, a boarding-house keeper, for detaining his baggage. His honour, who had deferred his judgment since the last hearing on the 9th of November, said that the right of detention had been claimed on the ground of custom. Some witnesses of fourteen and fifteen years' experience had corroborated the defendant's story that it was the usual custom to demand money in advance, or to secure themselves on the luggage. There was no right in law, however, to detain the goods, and he gave the plaintiff £5 damages, allowing a counterclaim for money due of £8 8s. 4d.

Conflicts between bench and bar, common enough in some countries, are, happily, says the *Globe*, rare in this country. Perhaps this want of experience may explain why such encounters as do occur are usually of a very commonplace order. Mr. Justice Ridley's encounter with Mr. Danckwerts, K.C., was not, from any point of view, a brilliant affair. "You really are ridiculous," said the judge impatiently. "Then I am ridiculous. Very well!" said Mr. Danckwerts, and he promptly resumed his seat. The learned judge threatened to leave the court, and the learned counsel was disinclined to resume his interrupted address, but eventually the business of the parties was proceeded with. Mr. Danckwerts did not follow the example of Mr. Benjamin, who, when a Law Lord, much given to interrupting the speeches of counsel, met an argument he was admiring with the ejaculation, "Ridiculous!" quietly tied up his papers, bowed politely to the judges, and retired from the House of Lords. Mr. Benjamin's action was not without effect. The noble lord who occasioned it promptly sent him a conciliatory letter.

On the question of contraband of war Lord Lansdowne writes to the secretary of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce stating that "his Majesty's Government have from the first objected to the extension of the doctrine of contraband of war, under which such articles as coal, cotton, and machinery have been classed as unconditionally contraband, and they adhere to the opinion which they have expressed on this point. The

Russian Government have, however, not as yet shown any disposition to regard coal otherwise than as absolute contraband, or to yield to the representations which his Majesty's ambassador has, as you are aware, addressed to them on the subject of raw cotton. With regard to machinery, the wording of the decision of the Prize Court in regard to certain machinery on board *The Calchas* confirms the view that it will be liable to condemnation if any is proved to be intended for warlike use. His Majesty's Government have, as already indicated on more than one occasion, stated that they would not consider themselves bound to recognize as valid any decision confirmed by the Prize Courts of last resort which might be inconsistent with well-established principles of international law, and they will strenuously support claims for compensation put forward by British subjects whose interests have suffered in consequence of any such decision. It is proper to bear in mind that since the date in September last when the Russian Government issued supplementary instructions to their naval officers the right of visit and search has not been exercised in a manner to which his Majesty's Government could reasonably take exception."

At the Winchester Assizes, on the 24th ult., says the *Times*, George Cozens Prior, a solicitor, pleaded "Guilty" to three indictments, two under the Larceny Act of 1901, and a third as trustee, for appropriating moneys left in his hands for investment. It appeared that Prior started as a solicitor at Portsmouth in 1888 with a partner named Binstead, who died in 1891, and the prisoner then carried on the business himself. In the early part of this year he filed his own petition in bankruptcy, and from the investigations therein made the present proceedings were instituted. It seemed that he kept three accounts—(1) for business; (2) clients' money; (3) private account. Only (2) was over in funds; the others were only in funds to the extent of a very few pounds. In the bankruptcy the liabilities amounted to £26,000 and the assets to between £1,500 to £2,000. In one of the charges the prosecutor was a clergyman in the North of England, who entrusted all his trust business to the prisoner and another solicitor, and the prisoner always stated that the money was invested. It appeared that he had gone in for a great deal of speculation in building schemes, notably the Portsmouth Building Society, and when that society failed he was a very considerable loser. Mr. Justice Wills, in passing sentence, said that it was a painful case, and at the same time a bad one. Many of the topics urged in mitigation he could not accede to. He was well acquainted with the disclosure made in the Portsmouth building case, for he had tried some of the officials, and such misfortunes afforded no excuse, or scarcely any palliation, for the offences the prisoner pleaded guilty to. He could not understand why persons belonging to an honourable profession continued to commit such crimes, knowing what punishment inevitably followed. The prisoner must be kept in penal servitude for five years.

At the Nottingham Assizes on Wednesday, before Mr. Justice Bucknill, William John Watson, solicitor, says the *Times*, charged, in two indictments, with forging certain deeds at Hucknall Torkard and at Nottingham, in the years 1900 and 1902. The prisoner pleaded "Guilty" to one charge and "Not Guilty" to the other. The facts in the case in which the prisoner pleaded "Guilty" were briefly these: In 1902 the prisoner went to Messrs. Larken & Co., solicitors, of Nottingham, in order to obtain £1,000 on a mortgage of some land at Breaston. On the 22nd of March, 1902, the prisoner received £1,000 from Messrs. Larken & Co., and handed to them two deeds—a conveyance and a mortgage. The conveyance purported to be from the prisoner and Mr. Tateham, as executors of the will of the prisoner's father, to William Mills. Mr. Tateham's signature was forged. The conveyance and mortgage were consequently worthless. The prisoner left Nottingham in May, 1904. In his absence a piece of paper was found in his office bearing an attempted imitation of Mr. Tateham's signature. The prisoner was arrested in Yorkshire in August, 1904. The prisoner's story was that his co-executor, Mr. Tateham, had consented to the deeds being used for the purpose of raising money to reduce the prisoner's bank overdraft. It was only when the arrangements for the mortgage were nearly completed that Mr. Tateham refused to carry it out, and the prisoner, therefore, forged the necessary signature. He had used the money so obtained to reduce the amount he owed to the bank and not directly to his own ends. Mr. Justice Bucknill, in sentencing the prisoner, said it was painful for him to have to send a member of a grand profession to prison. He took into consideration the fact that he would be struck off the rolls, that his name and reputation would be tarnished, and that he had not used the money he obtained for racing, but he could not, under the circumstances, and allowing for the fact that he had been in prison for four months awaiting trial, pass a less sentence than fifteen months' imprisonment with hard labour.

## Winding-up Notices.

### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—Friday, Nov. 25.

- ARROL BROS. LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arnold Wilfred Johanning, 5 and 6, Gt Winchester st.
- AUSTRIAN AND HUNGARIAN MICROSCOPE AND BIOGRAPH CO. LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Sidney J Field, 14, Piccadilly mansions, 17, Shaftesbury av.
- BRITISH COLUMBIAN STEAMSHIP TRADING AND AGENCY CO. LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented N v 22, directed to be heard Dec 6. Barnes, West st, Finsbury circle, sol for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 6.
- ETREBACH COPPER ESTATES, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required to send their names and addresses, and full particulars, in writing, of their claims or demands, to Fakeman & Read, Ironmonger ln, sol for company

MAGAZINE CO. LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 9, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to George H Rimer, 70, Cornhill

NORTHERN MINING AND DEVELOPMENT CO. LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Nov 24, directed to be heard Dec 6. Carr, Essex st, Strand, sol for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 5

OLD CASTLE RESTAURANT (1902), LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Hower, care of Peter Davies, 8, Cook st, Liverpool. Snowball & Co, Liverpool, sol for liquidator

T I SYNDICATE, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Fred A Hughes, 12 and 13, Henrietta st, Covent garden

ZEEKOWITZ INVENTIONS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 24, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Edward Gott, Osborne chambers, Bradford. Wright & Co, Bradford, sol for liquidator

### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Nov. 29.

ALEXANDER BROS. LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Douglas Melvill and Guillaume François Vallat, 18, Hatton gdn. White, Holborn viaduct, sol for liquidators

B F CHOMPTON, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Fiete ie Nightingale, 12, Acersfield, Bolton

BURCH'S NEW CROSS BREWERY, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Nov 24, directed to be heard Dec 13. Dyson & Co, Gt Winchester st, sol for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 13

CLEVELAND SUPPLY STORES, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 12, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Richard Jewett, 134, High st, Stockton on Tees. Archer & Co, Stockton on Tees, sol for liquidators

DIRO DECORATIVE ART CO. LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Rothwell, Knowley rd, 8; Holen's, Lancashire. Sharples & Son, Accrington, sol for liquidator

KENT SUPER AERATION, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 13, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Walter Scarlett, 36, High st, Ramsgate

MOFFATT & PAIGE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 17, to send their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts and claims, to Lewis Hardy, 8, Breems bldgs, Chancery ln

MUSIC TRADES CORPORATION, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Phillips, 127, Brixton hill

UNION COAL CO. LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to James L Mather, 23, Mornington rd, Bolton. Balshaws, Bolton, sol for liquidator

## Court Papers.

### Supreme Court of Judicature.

#### ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice KEENEWICH.	Mr. Justice FAIRWELL.
Monday, Dec. ....	5 Mr. Gresswell	Mr. Godfrey	Mr. Carrington	Mr. Theed
Tuesday .....	6 Church	R. Leach	Beal	W. Leach
Wednesday .....	7 Farmer	Godfrey	Carrington	Theed
Thursday .....	8 King	R. Leach	Beal	W. Leach
Friday .....	9 W. Leach	Godfrey	Carrington	Theed
Saturday .....	10 Theed	R. Leach	Beal	W. Leach

  

Date	Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.	Mr. Justice JOYCE.	Mr. Justice SWINER EADY.	Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.
Monday, Dec. ....	5 Mr. King	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Church	Mr. Beal
Tuesday .....	6 Farmer	Pemberton	Gresswell	Carrington
Wednesday .....	7 King	Jackson	Church	R. Leach
Thursday .....	8 Farmer	Pemberton	Gresswell	Godfrey
Friday .....	9 King	Jackson	Church	Pemberton
Saturday .....	10 Farmer	Pemberton	Gresswell	Jackson

## The Property Mart.

### Sales of the Ensuing Week.

- Dec. 8.—Messrs. STIMSON & SONS, at the Mart, at 2:—Harringay (opposite the railway station): Freehold Shop, let upon repairing lease at £35 per annum. Solicitor, H. B. Wedlake, Esq., London.—Old Kent road: By order of Trustees, a secure investment of £70 per annum equal to a ground-rent, detached Freehold Premises, known as Blenheim Laundry, 25, Marlborough-road, Old Kent road; let upon lease for 35 years from Christmas, 1893, at £70 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Francis Howse & Eve, London. (See advertisement, this week, p. iv.)
- Dec. 8.—Mr. GEO. FUTVOYE FRANCOIS, at the Mart, at 2:—Freehold Corner House, No. 1, Marine-parade, at the end of the Esplanade, Bognor, Sussex; let on lease at £100 per annum. Also the long leasehold Modern Detached Residence, Sussex House, close to The Terrace, Richmond-hill, S.W.; let at £150. Solicitors, Messrs. Mead & Sons, London. (See advertisement, Nov. 16, p. iv.)

### Result of Sale.

#### REVERSIONS, LIFE POLICIES, AND SHARES.

Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD held their usual Fortnightly Sale (No. 776) of the above interests at the Mart, E.C., on Thursday last, when the whole of the Lots offered, with one exception, were sold, the total of sale being upwards of £9,140.

REVERSIONS:	£	s.	d.
Absolute to a Moiety; life 60 .....	Sold	2,170	0 0
Absolute to One-fourty-fourth of £101,788; life 59 .....	"	990	0 0
Absolute to £2,920; life 54 .....	"	1,220	0 0
Absolute to One-half of £9,776; lives 83 and 55 .....	"	1,800	0 0
To Leaseholds producing £28 per annum; life 60 .....	"	200	0 0
LIFE POLICIES:			
For £2,000; life 42 .....	"	875	0 0
For £1,700; life 50 .....	"	735	0 0
For £300; life 61 .....	"	445	0 0
SHARES:			
Canvond Mortgage Co. (Limited), 50 Shares of £5 each, fully paid .....	"	206	5 0
Educational Supply Association (Limited), 105 Ordinary Shares and 375 Preference of £1 each Shares full paid .....	"	479	7 6

## Creditors' Notices.

### Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, NOV. 25.

BUXTON, ANN JANE, Beaumaris, Anglesea Dec 22 Stowe v Stowe, Registrar, Liverpool  
 LEE, GEORGE, Cobham, Surrey, Timber Merchant Dec 31 Lee v Aldin, Warrington, J  
 Tempary, Bedford row  
 STUDD, WILLIAM, Iwer, Buckingham, Farmer Dec 31 Ashby v Studds, Farmer, J  
 Gainer, Uxbridge

## Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, NOV. 25.

ALEXANDER, JOSEPH, Stockbury, Kent, Farmer Dec 16 Winch & Winch, Chatham  
 BENGER, ALFRED CHARLES, Herton, Bishops Canning, Wilt, Baker Dec 21 Smith,  
 Devizes  
 BETTS, MARIANNE, Teignmouth, Devon Jan 14 Tizer & Co Teignmouth  
 BISHOP, EDWARD WALLACE, Haslemere, Surrey Jan 7 Musick & Nisbet, John at, Bedford  
 row  
 BRUNKER, FRANCIS HENRY, St Mary axe, Merchant Dec 20 Baker & Naine, Crosby sq  
 BYATT, SARAH ANN, Colwyn Bay, Denbigh Dec 29 Goodall & Co, Nottingham  
 CAMPBELL, CATHERINE MARIA, Bath Jan 12 Stone & Co, Bath  
 CARTER, ROBERT JOSEPH, Mares at, Hackney, Bookseller Dec 31 Richardson & Sellers,  
 Golden sq  
 CLARKE, MARY, Norton Woodseats, Darby Dec 23 Lucas & Padley, Sheffield  
 COHEN, DAVID, Dalton, Fruiterer Dec 31 Davis, Liverpool at  
 COUGHER, JAMES, Kelvinside, Glasgow Dec 24 Routh & Co, Southampton st, Blooms-  
 bury  
 CROWTHER, DANIEL, Bradford Dec 21 Gaunt & Co, Bradford  
 DABRY, SAMUEL, Martock, Somerset Dec 31 Poole, South Petherton, Somerset  
 DETTALL, WILLIAM, Aston, Warwick Jan 1 Bradley & Dain, Birmingham  
 DUNNELL, THOMAS, Thirsk, Yorks, General Dealer Dec 5 Huley, Leeds  
 DUGOLAN-WILLIAMS, PERCY, Clynderwen, Pembroke Dec 21 Ravenscroft & Co, John st,  
 Bedford row  
 FOX, MARGARET ANNA, Clifton, Bristol Dec 31 Clark, Bristol  
 GATHERCOLE, TITUS, Earlsfield, Surrey, Commercial Traveller Dec 30 Walpole, Brandon,  
 Norfolk  
 GROVE, JOHN, Lyons Regis Dec 16 HS & S Watts, Yeovil  
 HADDUCK, CAROLINE, Ipswich Dec 31 Cobbold & Co, Ipswich  
 HANER, THOMAS, Newcome, Huddersfield, Licensed Victualler Dec 31 Sykes, Huddersfield  
 HAY, EDWARD, Haswell Dec 31 Colman & Knight, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn  
 HAY, HENRY, or HARRIETT HAY, Haswell Dec 31 Colman & Knight, Raymond bldgs,  
 Gray's inn  
 HODGSON, ARCHIBALD HENRY, Bownham, Southampton Jan 1 Warner & Kirby,  
 Winchester  
 HODGSON, PETER, Whitehaven Dec 24 Atkinson & Bennett, Whitehaven  
 HUDSON, ALFRED, Bramham, Yorks, Grocer Jan 6 Walker, Armes, Leeds  
 HUGGOTT, MARY ANN, Spook, Kent Dec 24 Robinson, Strood  
 JENNIE, THOMAS, Newport, I of W, Builder Jan 4 Eldridge & Sons, Newport  
 KNIGHT, EDWARD HENRY, Sharnham, Sussex, Newsagent Dec 30 Gates & Gates,  
 Brighton  
 LANTIN, THOMAS, Sure at, Tottenham Court rd Dec 30 Morten & Co, Newgate at  
 LORRAINE-GREEN, ROBERT ALFRED, Stallarow Court, nr Bristol Dec 23 Gamlen & Co,  
 Gray's inn sq  
 LUDLAM, FELIX, Burghfield, Berks Jan 9 Tamplin & Co, Fenchurch st  
 MACANDREIGH, PETER, Slough, Berks Dec 25 Whitley & Co, Liverpool  
 MALLAN, RICHARD, Broadbury villas, Kilburn Dec 31 Davis, Liverpool at  
 MARTIN, DAVID WILLIAM PEARSON, Rotheridge, Essex, Mariner Dec 6 Prior, Colchester  
 O'KEEFE, EDWARD, Waterloo, Lancs Dec 25 Atkinson, Liverpool  
 PEARSON, JOHN JAMES RICHARD, Gtrembury, nr Banbury, Northampton, Licensed Victualler  
 Jan 10 Wilkins & Toy, Chipping Norton  
 PEARSON, SARAH ANN, Chipping Norton, Oxford, Licensed Victualler Jan 10 Wilkins  
 & Toy, Chipping Norton  
 PIKE, JANE, Bath Jan 12 Stone & Co, Bath  
 RAIKES, LUCIA GEORGINA, Claven hill gins, Hyde Park Jan 10 Arnould & Son, New ct,  
 Lincoln's inn  
 REITH, JOHN EDWARD, Lee, Kent Jan 29 Cook, Broad st bldgs, Liverpool at  
 RICHARDS, HENRY, Halifax, Bookseller Dec 31 FG & HE Smith, Halifax

## Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, NOV. 25.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BARNA, TON, Derby, Grocer and Best Seller Derby Pet  
 Nov 23 Ord Nov 23  
 BARTER, JOHN A, Dalton in, Shoe Manufacturer High  
 Court Pet Oct 28 Ord Nov 22  
 BOWEN, EDWIN, Bradford, Tramway Inspector Bradford  
 Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23  
 BROWN, BENJAMIN, Cambridge, Hay Buyer Cambridge  
 Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 BROWN, JOHN BLOANE, Newington Green rd, Baker High  
 Court Pet Nov 2 Ord Nov 23  
 BUCKLE, JOHN EMMET, Hilary, nr Uxbridge, Builder  
 Windsor Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 19  
 CANNING, JOSEPH, jun, Southall, Manufacturer Windsor  
 Pet Oct 27 Ord Nov 23  
 CARRINGTON, WALTER, Manchester, Patent Glazing Engineer  
 Manchester Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 DARTLEY, WALTER, Pottersfield, Yorks, Builder Wakefield  
 Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 23  
 FOSALL, ALBERT EDWARD, Worcester, Tailor Worcester  
 Pet Nov 5 Ord Nov 22  
 FREDERICK, LEONARD JOSEPH, and HENRY THOMAS  
 FREDERICK, Wolverhampton, Trunk Manufacturers  
 Wolverhampton Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 GORD, WILLIAM JOHN, Westbury on Trym, Bristol,  
 Nurseryman Bristol Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23  
 GORD, HENRY, Killingbourne, Lancs, Brick Merchant Gt  
 Grimsby Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 21  
 GREENWOOD, EDWARD, Barton, Lancs, Joiner Preston Pet  
 Nov 23 Ord Nov 22  
 GRIMM, CARLUS JULIUS ALFRED, Walsingham, Norfolk,  
 Tailor Ipswich Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22  
 HENDERSON, JON, Oldham, Joiner Oldham Pet Nov 23  
 Ord Nov 23

HARDING, JAMES, Bargoed, Glam, Collier Merthyr Tydfil  
 Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22  
 HINGLIFER, THOMAS THACKERAY, Hertogate, Journey-  
 man Joiner York Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 HUTCHINGS, C, Balham, Plumber Wandsworth Pet Oct  
 14 Pet Nov 22  
 HYDE, JOHN, Darfield, nr Barnsley, Farmer Barnsley Pet  
 Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 JACKSON, THOMAS ANTHONY, Wellingborough, Northampton,  
 Confectioner Northampton Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22  
 JESTER, ERNEST, Birmingham, Corn Factor Birmingham  
 Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22  
 JEWELL, WILLIAM THOMAS, Croydon Croydon Pet Nov  
 22 Ord Nov 22  
 KING, WILLIAM AUGUSTUS, Derby Borough Lunatic  
 Asylum, Derby, Furniture Remover Derby Pet Oct  
 4 Ord Nov 21  
 KIRK, WALTER, Leeds, Cycle Maker Leeds Pet Nov 21  
 Ord Nov 21  
 KNIFE, WILLIAM, Hawkhead, Lancs, Blacksmith Kendal  
 Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 LAKE, W B, Whitehorse st, Stepney, Provision Dealer  
 High Court Pet Oct 29 Ord Nov 23  
 LEWIS, HARRY, Gloucester, Barrister at Law Gloucester  
 Pet Nov 11 Ord Nov 22  
 LORAN, JOHN M, Hewitt rd, Harringay, Dealer in Jew-  
 ellery High Court Pet Oct 26 Ord Nov 23  
 MCCRAW, MALCOLM, Queensborough ter High Court Pet  
 Sept 2 Ord Nov 23  
 PRICE, GWILYN, Birchgrove, Llanamlet Higher, Glam,  
 Haulier Swansea Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23  
 REANEY, WILLIAM, Bolton, Derby, Miner Chesterfield  
 Pet Nov 11 Ord Nov 21  
 ROGE, FLETCHER, Hadfield, nr Manchester Ashton under  
 Lyne Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 21  
 SADLER, CHARLES SHORT, Fulham, Dairyman's Assistant  
 High Court Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22  
 SHAW, EDWIN MARTIN, Leeds, Leather Manufacturer's  
 Manager Leeds Pet Nov 31 Ord Nov 31

SIMPSON, ALEXANDER PERCY, Atherstone, Warwick,  
 Finister Birmingham Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 SWAIN, WILLIAM CHARLES, Moorlitch, Somerset, Innkeeper  
 Bridgwater Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23  
 SZAPIRA, H M, Charing Cross roads, Charing Cross, Com-  
 pany Director High Court Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 21  
 TAYLOR, EDGAR BENJAMIN, Walsall, Pastry Cook Walsall  
 Pet Nov 19 Ord Nov 19  
 THOMAS, WALTER HAROLD, Nantymoel, Glam, Draper  
 Pet Oct 31 Ord Nov 19  
 TINDALL, A C, Brixton hill, Accountant Wandsworth  
 Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 22  
 TOOE, ERNEST WILLIAM, Folkestone, Photographer  
 Cheltenham Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23  
 TRAVES, MORDECAI THOMAS OTHO, Frinton on Sea, Essex  
 Colchester Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21  
 WESTON, HENRY, JOSEPH GEORGE HOLMES, and ERNEST  
 HENRY WESTON, Leicester Leicester Pet Nov 22 Ord  
 Nov 22

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

FLOSKIN, G (sued as G FLOSKIN) (Male), Hos st, Waltham-  
 stow, Butcher High Court Rec Ord Oct 26 Rec  
 Nov 23

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALMOND, JOHN, Sutton, St Helens, Lancs, Farmer Dec  
 7 at 12 Off Rec, 15, Victoria st, Liverpool  
 ANDREWS, FREDERICK JOHN, Farnham, Pork Butcher Dec  
 6 at 11 30 24, Railway app, London Bridge  
 BAXTER, JOHN A, Dalton in, Shoe Manufacturer Dec 6 at  
 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 BEATTY, PHILIP VALENTINE, Market Harborough,  
 Leicestershire, Horse Dealer Dec 6 at 12 Off Rec, 1,  
 Berridge st, Leicester  
 BROWN, JOHN BLOANE, Newington Green rd, Baker Dec 6  
 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 COLLINS, THOMAS, Forest Gate, Essex, Plumber Dec 6 at 11  
 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

STAFFORD, THOMAS, Marsham Grange, Notts, Farmer Jan 6 Stafford, Scarrington, nr  
 Nottingham  
 STAYERS, ELIZABETH, Waterloo, Blyth, Northumberland Dec 27 Sidney & Co, Blyth  
 SUMMERS, SAMUEL JAMES, Thornton Heath Dec 24 Tillet, Laurence Pountney hill  
 SUTHERLAND, GEORGE, Ashby, Northampton Dec 21 Darrell & Price, Northampton  
 THOMAS, LEWIS, Nelson, Glam Dec 31 Horley, Cardiff  
 THOMSON, ROBERT DOTT, Chester Dec 30 Barker & Rogerson, Chester  
 THOMAS, WILLIAM, Grindleton, Yorks Jan 21 Baldwin & Co, Clitheroe  
 WATSON, SIR WALTER JOSEPH, Victoria st, Westminster Dec 31 Lawrence & Co, New sq,  
 Lincoln's inn  
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Morriston, Glam Dec 30 James & Thomas, Swansea  
 WOOD, WILLIAM, Slaidburn, Yorks Jan 21 Baldwin & Co, Clitheroe

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, NOV. 29.

BADGER, SAMUEL, Biddington, Surrey, Engineer Jan 3 Vanderpump & Co, Gray's inn sq  
 BAGLEY, ALICE, Hyson Green, Nottingham Dec 24 Fox & Manning, Nottingham  
 BARNETT, ROBERT GIDEON ISRAEL, Shaftesbury av, Mortgage Broker Jan 1 Ralph &  
 Co, Moorgate st  
 BEARD, SARAH, Kidderminster Dec 29 Ivens & Co, Kidderminster  
 BERRY, RICHARD, Liverpool, Grocer Dec 23 Rudd, Liverpool  
 BLUNDELL, WILLIAM HENRY, Spencer rd, Stoke Newington Jan 14 Cook, Broad st  
 bldgs, Liverpool at  
 BOUCHIER, ANN, Heywood, Lancs Dec 24 Grundy & Co, Manchester  
 BRADLEY, ISAAC BENJAMIN, Hastings Feb 14 Ellis, St Leonards on Sea  
 CADDY, SAMUEL KITTLE, Margate, Chemist Dec 21 Bys & Maughan, Margate  
 CAWTHORN, WILLIAM HENRY, Cambridge, Brewer Dec 31 Ginn & Matthew, Cambridge  
 COULTAS, WILLIAM DAWSON, Leeds Dec 17 Milner, Leeds  
 CRABTREE, JAMES, Bradford Jan 2 Gaunt & Co, Broad ord  
 CROMPTON, WILLIAM, Clayton, Bradford Jan 3 Anley, Halifax  
 DAVIS, GEORGE, Rusholme, Manchester Jan 6 Sutton & Co, Manchester  
 DOCKREY, JANE, Leamington 140 31 Docker, Birmingham  
 DOWNS, JAMES, Bridlington, Yorks Dec 21 Stuart, Hull  
 DRURY, BENJAMIN, Kingston upon Hull Dec 15 Drury, Goole  
 EDVYEN-WALKER, HENRY, Rugby Jan 6 Fuller & Son, Rugby  
 EVANS, CATHERINE FAANCES, Frestatyn, Flint Dec 31 Gamin, Rhyl  
 ELLIOT, COL GEORGE AUGUSTUS, Southsea Dec 31 Williamson & Co, Sherborne in, King  
 William st  
 ELLIS, GRACE, Nottory rd, Putney Jan 10 Ellis, St Leonards on Sea  
 EYE, JOHN CHAPLIN, Buntinghall, Essex Dec 31 Gibson & Bond, Ogar  
 FINEY, JOHN, Whitby, Chester Dec 7 Wilson, Birkbead  
 FULL, GEN CHARLES BOWDLER, EA, Ealing Jan 10 Roke & Macdonald, Bath  
 GILL, GEORGE, Halifax, Warehouseman Dec 26 Godfrey & Co, Halifax  
 GILBERT, DANIEL, Enfield Dec 30 Russell & Russell, Coleman at  
 GREENWAY, WALTER THOMAS, Brierley Hill, Staffs, Solicitor's Managing Clerk Dec 17  
 Gould & Meock, Stourbridge  
 HINES, CHARLES JOHN EDWARD, Old Catton, Norfolk, Engineer Jan 1 Hines, Mount  
 pleasant, Norwich  
 HOULT, CHARLES, Whitstable, Shipowner Jan 2 Staition, Whitstable  
 HOWARD, EDWARD CARINGTON, Stockport Dec 14 Jones & Co, Manche ter  
 HURRY, WILLIAM, Stretford, Lancs Dec 28 Lea, Manchester  
 ILEY, ROBERT, Stockton on Tees, Licensed Valuer Dec 24 Punch & Robson, Middles-  
 brough  
 JACKSON, REV FREDERIC, Wisbech Jan 1 Furber & Son, Gray's inn sq  
 JAMISON, CB, Surg-Gen JAMES, Eltham, Kent Dec 27 Hopwoods & Dowson, Spring gdn  
 KEY, ELEANOR CHARLOTTE, Norwich Dec 24 Clarke, Norwich  
 KIRBY, SAMUEL, Leeds, Horse Dealer Dec 21 W & E Foster, Leeds  
 LAX, PAUL, Moorgate st, French Avocat Dec 13 Hicks & Co, King's sq, Covent garden  
 LICHTENBERG, ADOLPHUS LEONARD, Turle rd, Tollymore pk, Commission Agent Dec 19  
 Barnes, West st, Finsbury circus  
 LONG, CLAUDIUS HORATIUS, Whitehill, Caterham, Surrey Feb 1 Rogers & Sons,  
 Victoria st, Westminster  
 LOVERING, ELIZABETH, St Austell, Cornwall Jan 2 Carlyon & Stephens, St Austell  
 MARSTON, JAMES, Eardsley, Hereford, Farmer Dec 24 Temple & Phipps, Kingston,  
 Hereford  
 MAXWELL, ROBERT GREENVELL, St Albans Dec 25 A F & R W Tweedie, Lincoln's inn  
 fields  
 MCABE, ERNEST, Ramsgate Jan 1 Hills & Drury, Ramsgate  
 PADDY, ANDREW HENRY, Penkridge, Staffs Dec 31 Stratton & Son, Wolverhampton  
 PARSONS, HENRY, Skidmore st, Stepney Dec 31 Tatham & Co, Queen Victoria st  
 PIERCE, CHARLES CHRISTMAS, Epson Dec 30 Yelland & Co, Vincent sq, Westminster  
 SAWYER, HANNAH, Brixton rd, Brixton Dec 31 Fraser & Christian, Finsbury circus  
 THOMAS, THOMAS, Liverpool, Tailor Jan 1 Symond, Liverpool  
 THOMPSON, ABRAHAM, Smallbridge, Rochdale Dec 31 Standing & Co, Rochdale  
 WEBBER, SARAH, West Kensington mans, Beaumont cres Dec 30 Canning, Craven st,  
 Charing Cross  
 WRIGHT, MARGARET JOHNSON, Berwick upon Tweed Dec 15 J C & R Weddell, Berwick  
 upon Tweed

COOKE, THOMAS, jun, Reading, Clothier Dec 6 at 11 The George Hotel, Huddersfield

DAVIES, MORGAN, Bootle, nr Liverpool, Builder Dec 6 at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

FACER, CHARLES RODGER, Lutterworth, Leicester, Shoeing Smith Dec 6 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

FLOWERS, THOMAS, JOHN WHITMAN, and WILLIAM ROSE, Earl's Barton, Northampton, Boot Manufacturers Dec 6 at 11 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton

HADLAND, ROBERT SHOFF, Stoke by Clare, Suffolk, Farmer Dec 6 at 12 Off Rec, 5, Petty Cur, Cambridge

HINCHELFFE, THOMAS TRACKWAY, Hartgate, Joiner Dec 5 at 2.30 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York

IMPETT, LEONARD EDWIN, Swanley, Kent, Nurseryman 5 at 11.30 115, High st, Rochester

JONES, THOMAS GRIFFITH, Llanreost, Denbigh, Agent Dec 3 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

JOSTY, HODOLPH ALBERT, Troskey, Glam, Blind Manufacturer Dec 5 at 3.15 135, High st, Mether Tydd

KIRK, WALTER, Leeds, Cycle Maker Dec 6 at 11.30 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

KNOTT, MAJOR M E, Stirling st, Montpellier sq Dec 5 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MARKHAM, GEORGE, Gt Grimsby, Carter Dec 6 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House in, Hull

MASON, EDWARD JOSEPH, Aston, Warwick, Grocer Dec 6 at 11 Bank chmbrs, 151, Corporation st, Birmingham

PARRY, THOMAS, Talycafn, Denbigh, Builder Dec 9 at 2.45 North-Western Hotel, Blaenau Ffestiniog

PAYNE, ALBERT VICTOR, Coventry, Licensed Victualler Dec 5 at 12 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry

REES, REES, Pentrechwyth, Swansea, Spelterman Dec 8 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea

RHODES, RICHARD, Accrington, Lancs, Boot Maker Dec 7 at 11.15 County Court House, Blackburn

ROBERTS, JOHN, Rhosodroln, Llanbellig, Carnarvon, Storeman Dec 3 at 11.30 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

ROMANA, JAMES, Gloucester Dec 8 at 12 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester

SHAW, EDWIN MARTIN, Leeds, Leather Manufacturer's Manager Dec 6 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

SHUTTLEWORTH, JAMES, Whitcomb st, Licensed Victualler's Manager Dec 5 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

SILCOCK, FRANK, Sheffield, Joiner Dec 7 at 11 Off Rec, Figgins in, Sheffield

TREBUTT, HERBERT SAMSON, Northampton, Tailor Dec 6 at 11.30 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton

TYSON, HENRY, Halifax, Contractor Dec 6 at 12 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax

WHITEHOUSE, ALBERT JAMES, Newport, Butcher Dec 6 at 11 Off Rec, Westgate chmbrs, Newport, Mon

WILLIAMS, GRIFFITH, Tanygrisiau, Blaenau Ffestiniog, Merioneth, Leichest Dec 3 at 11.45 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

WILLIAMS, JAMES, Gwynnogogwren, Glam Dec 6 at 2.15 Townhall, Neath

WILLIAMS, ROBERT, Garn, Dolbenmaen, Carnarvon, Woollen Manufacturer Dec 9 at 5.15 Sportsman Hotel, Portmadoc

WILLIAMS, ROBERT JOHN, Rhiwbyrdy, Blaenau Ffestiniog, Merioneth, Grocer Dec 9 at 2 North-Western Hotel, Blaenau Ffestiniog

WOODROFFE, GEORGE HENRY, Leicester Dec 5 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

## ADJUDICATIONS.

ANDREWS, FREDERICK JOHN, Farnham, Pork Butcher Guildford Pet Nov 16 Ord Nov 19

ASHWORTH, WILLIAM EDWARD, Rochdale, Printer Rochdale Pet Oct 26 Ord Nov 21

BARKS, TOM, Derby, Grocer Derby Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

BARHAM, CHARLES FREDERICK, Bishopgate st Without, Restaurant Keeper High Court Pet March 30 Ord Nov 22

BERTING, FREDERICK RICHARD, Basinghall st, Manufacturer's Agent High Court Pet Sept 24 Ord Nov 22

BOWEN, ENOCH, Bradford, Tramway Inspector Bradford Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

BROWN, BENJAMIN, Cambridge, Hay Buyer Cambridge Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

COMBER, CHARLES HENRY, Chapswot mans, Baywater High Court Pet Aug 29 Ord Nov 22

FRAZER, JOSEPH, West Dulwich, Company Promoter High Court Pet June 30 Ord Nov 18

GARNER, JOHN, Crewe, Builder Nantwich Pet Oct 31 Ord Nov 22

GERRISON, RICHARD, Barton, Lancs, Joiner Preston Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

GRIFFITH, CECILIA, Ystrad, Rhosdda, Glam, Hotel Proprietress Portfield Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 22

GUIER, CAMILLE JULES ALFRED, Walsingham, Suffolk, Tailor Ipswich Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22

HAMPSHIRE, JOE, Oldham, Joiner Oldham Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

HARDING, JAMES, Bargoed, Glam, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 23

HEYNAN, HENRY, Lower North st, Poplar, Wall Paper Merchant High Court Pet Oct 24 Ord Nov 22

HINCHELFFE, THOMAS TRACKWAY, Hartgate, Joiner York Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

HOLLOWAY, ALICE ELLIS, Bristol, Grocer Bristol Pet Nov 14 Ord Nov 21

HOMER, JOHN MASTERMAN, Throgmorton by High Court Pet June 15 Ord Nov 18

HYDE, JOHN, Darfield, nr Barnsley, Farmer Barnsley Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

JACKSON, THOMAS ANTHUS, Wellingborough, Northampton, Confectioner Northampton Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 22

JEWELL, WILLIAM THOMAS, Croydon Croydon Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22

KIRK, WALTER, Leeds, Cycle Maker Leeds Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

KNEER, JAMES, Newcastle on Tyne, Provision Importer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Nov 17 Ord Nov 22

KWIFE, WILLIAM, Hawkhead, Lancs, Blacksmith Kendal Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

LEWIS, HARRY, Gloucester, Barrister at Law Gloucester Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22

OLDHURT, HENRY JAMES, Knighton, Radnor, Butcher Leominster Pet Oct 29 Pet Nov 22

PAICE, GWILYM, Birchgrove, Llanmallet Higher, Glam, Haulier Swansea Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

SADLER, CHARLES SHORT, Fulham, Dairyman's Assistant High Court Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22

SHAW, EDWIN MARTIN, Leeds Leeds Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

SHUTTLEWORTH, JAMES, Whitcomb st, Licensed Victualler's Manager High Court Pet Oct 14 Ord Nov 23

SIMPSON, ALEXANDER PERCY, Atherstone, Warwick, Fruiterer Birmingham Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

SWAIN, WILLIAM CHARLES, Moorlinch, Somerset, Innkeeper Bridgewater Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

TAYLOR, EDGAR BENJAMIN, Walsall, Pastrycook Walsall Pet Nov 19 Ord Nov 19

TAYLOR, JOHN ALEXANDER BISHAM, Bath, Atty Tutor Bath Pet Nov 12 Ord Nov 20

THOMAS, WALTER HAROLD, Nantymoel, Glam, Draper Cardiff Pet Oct 31 Ord Nov 22

TOOZE, ERNEST WILLIAM, Folkestone, Photographer Cheltenham Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

TRAVERS, MORDAUNT THOMAS OTTO, Frinton on Sea, Essex Colchester Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21

WESTON, HENRY, JOSEPH GEORGE HOLMES, and ERNEST HENRY WESTON, Leicester Leicester Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 22

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct 11:

GARDNER, ALAN HYDE, Surrey, Strand High Court Pet July 27 Ord Oct 7

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, NOV. 20.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALBION & SON, JOHN, Birmingham, Rope Manufacturers Birmingham Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 22

ARMAN, WILLIAM LUND, Withernsea, Yorks Kingston upon Hull Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

BACKES, VALENTINE, Gossett st, Bethnal Green, Baker High Court Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

BAUM, FRANK, Bowdon, Cheshire, Photographer Manchester Pet Nov 12 Ord Nov 24

BAYLIS, JOHN, Horseley Heath, Tipton, Staffs, Sugar Boiler Dudley Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

BOURNE, LEWIS, Dudley, Worcester, General Dealer Dudley Pet Nov 16 Ord Nov 25

BRAGO, CHARLES, Leeds, Fruit Merchant Leeds Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

BREARLEY, HERBERT HAROLD, Rochdale, Coal Merchant Rochdale Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

CARTER, ARTHUR HERBERT, Kettering, Insurance Agent Northampton Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

COOKE, HARRY, Normacot, Longton, Staffs, Electrical Engineer Stoke on Trent Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

CROWTHER, GEORGE ARTHUR, Chetham, Lancs, Drug Dealer Salford Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

DOWLAND, SYDNEY THOMAS, and FRED RICHARDS, Parkstone, Dorset, Builders Poole Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

EDWARDS, FRANK, and HENRY EDWARD TAYLER, Bristol, Fruiterers Bristol Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

FORD, CHARLES, Kingston upon Hull Kingston upon Hull Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

FORBETH, WILLIAM STEWART, Fulwell, nr Sunderland, Clerk Sunderland Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

FURSTENAU, LOUIS, and FREDERICK JOHN LEDGER, Mansion House chmbrs High Court Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 25

GASKELL, WALTER JOHN, and ARTHUR REDFERN HALSALL, Liverpool General Merchants Liverpool Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

GREEN, HARRY, Earby, Thornton in Craven, Yorks, Tin Plate Worker Bradford Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

HARRIS & HOPKINSTER, Mile End rd, Manufacturing Confectioners High Court Pet Oct 15 Ord Nov 25

HASTINGS, CHARLES HOLLAND, Grosvenor st High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Nov 25

HEATHCOTE, JAMES LYONS, Handley, Chester, Farmer Macclesfield Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 22

IND, FREDERICK, and HERBERT IND, Margate, Bakers Canterbury Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

INGLESON, THOMAS, Leeds, Manufacturer's Agent Leeds Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

JOEL, SOLOMON, Camden Town, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 25

JURD, ARTHUR, Goldhawk rd, Auctioneer High Court Pet Nov 20 Ord Nov 26

LUND, WILLIAM, Scarborough, Licensed Victualler Scarborough Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

MORGAN, ARTHUR, Broadheath, nr Altrincham, Grocer Manchester Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

PARKER, G A, Finchley, Barnet Pet Oct 4 Ord Nov 24

SAUNDERS, DANIEL WARD, East Molesey, Private Hotel Keeper Kingston, Surrey Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

SHILTON, R W, Percival st, Goswell rd High Court Pet Nov 3 Ord Nov 24

STANHOPE, ALBERT EDWARD, Burdett rd, Bow, Boot Maker High Court Pet Nov 1 Ord Nov 24

THORPE, EMMA JANE, Flixton, nr Manchester, Commission Agent Manchester Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

TRADING AND INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION, Victoria st, Westminster High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Nov 24

WATSON, WILLIAM, and GEORGE HUNTINGTON, Dering st, Bond st, Electricians High Court Pet Oct 6 Ord Nov 17

WEAVER, THOMAS, Reading, Mineral Water Manufacturer Reading Pet Sept 18 Ord Oct 27

WOOD, RICHARD, Broadgar, Kent, Farmer Rochester Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

WOODS, JOHN THOMAS, Long Sutton, Lincoln, Farmer King's Lynn Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

YOUNGS, ELIJAH, Fleggburgh, Norfolk, Market Gardener Gt Yarmouth Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Nov 18:

MARCH, GEORGE SAMUEL JAMES, Croydon, Surrey, Bricklayer Croydon Pet Oct 27 Ord Nov 15

## FIRST MEETINGS.

BACKES, VALENTINE, Gossett st, Bethnal Green, Baker Dec 9 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

BELL, WILLIAM, jun, New Cleechporch, Fish Merchant Dec 7 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby

BOWER, ENOCH, Bradford, Tramway Inspector Dec 7 at 3 Off Rec, 20, Tyndal st, Bradford

BRAGO, CHARLES, Leeds, Fruit Merchant Dec 7 at 11 Off Rec, 23, Park row, Leeds

CURRY, WALTER, Manchester, Patent Glazing Engineer Dec 7 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

EASON, WILLIAM HOPKINSON, Bass, Moulton Chapel, Lancs, Farmer Dec 7 at 11.45 White Hart Hotel, Spalding

EDWARDS, FRANK, and HENRY EDWARD TAYLER, Bristol, Fruiterers Dec 7 at 12 Off Rec, 36, Baldwin st, Bristol

ENGLISH, ARTHUR PERCY, Ipswich, Baker Dec 16 at 2.15 Off Rec, 34, Princes st, Ipswich

FORBETH, WILLIAM STEWART, Fulwell, nr Sunderland, Clerk Dec 7 at 3 Off Rec, 24, John st, Sunderland

FREDERICK, LEONARD JOSEPH, and HENRY THOMAS FREDERICK, Wolverhampton, Trunk Manufacturers Dec 7 at 2.50 Off Rec, Wolverhampton

FURSTENAU, LOUIS, and FREDERICK JOHN LEDGER, Mansion House chmbrs Dec 9 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

GASKELL, WALTER JOHN, and ARTHUR REDFERN HALSALL, Liverpool, General Merchants Dec 7 at 2.30 Off Rec, 36, Victoria st, Liverpool

GIBBS, WALTER, Faversham, Kent, General Dealer Dec 13 at 9 Off Rec, 68, Castle st, Canterbury

GOLD, WILLIAM JOHN, Westbury upon Trym, Bristol, Nurseryman Dec 7 at 11.30 Off Rec, 25, Baldwin st, Bristol

GORTON, JONATHAN C, Ipswich Dec 16 at 2 Off Rec, Princes st, Ipswich

GUIER, CAMILLE JULES ALFRED, Walsingham, Suffolk, Tailor Dec 18 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Princes st, Ipswich

HAMPSHIRE, JOE, Oldham, Joiner Dec 13 at 12 Off Rec, Groves st, Oldham

HARDING, JAMES, Bargoed, Glam, Collier Dec 7 at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

HARRISON, GEORGE, Mansion House chmbrs, Queen Victoria st, Stock Broker Dec 12 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HEATHCOTE, JAMES, LYONS, Handley, Cheshire, Farmer Dec 9 at 11.30 Off Rec, 23, King Edward st, Macclesfield

HYDE, JOHN, Darfield, nr Barnsley, Farmer Dec 7 at 10 Off Rec, 7, Regent st, Barnsley

IND, FREDERICK, and HERBERT IND, Margate, Bakers Dec 9 at 11.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

INGLESON, THOMAS, Leeds, Manufacturer's Agent Dec 7 at 11.30 Off Rec, 25, Park row, Leeds

JACKSON, THOMAS ANTHUS, Wellingborough, Confectioner Dec 7 at 12 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton

JONES, EVAN, Barthmest, Merioneth, Painter Dec 13 at 12 Townhall, Aberystwyth

LEGG, GEORGE ALFRED, High rd, Broadbury, Tobaccoist Dec 7 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

LLEWELLYN, GEORGE HENRY, Newport, Mon, Solicitor Dec 8 at 11.30 The Westgate Hotel, Commercial st, Newport, Mon

LONGMAN, JOHN M, Harringay, Dealer in Jewellery Dec 8 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MARCH, GEORGE SAMUEL JAMES, Croydon, Bricklayer Dec 7 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge

ROBERTS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Haverfordwest, Coal Merchant Dec 9 at 11.30 Castle Hotel, Haverfordwest

SADLER, CHARLES SHORT, Parsons Green in, Fulham, Dairyman's Assistant Dec 7 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

SHILTON, R W, Percival st, Goswell rd Dec 7 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

STANHOPE, ALBERT EDWARD, Turners rd, Bow, Boot Maker Dec 8 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

STOTT, WILLIAM, Rochdale, Grocer Dec 9 at 11.15 Town Hall, Rochdale

SWAIN, WILLIAM CHARLES, Moorlinch, Somerset, Innkeeper Dec 7 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Baldwin

SEAFORTH, H M, Bathhouse, Company Director Dec 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

TAYLOR, EDGAR BENJAMIN, Walsall, Pastry Cook Dec 7 at 3 Off Rec, Wolverhampton

TAYLOR, ROBERT, Oldham, Joiner Dec 13 at 11 Off Rec, Groves st, Oldham

TRAVERS, MORDAUNT THOMAS OTTO, Frinton on Sea, Essex, Dec 30 at 11 Cups Hotel, Colchester

WARRINGTON, JOSEPH, Congleton, Cheshire, Butcher Dec 9 at 10.45 Off Rec, 35, King Edward st, Macclesfield

WATSON, WILLIAM, and GEORGE HUNTINGTON, Dering st, Bond st, Electricians Dec 9 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

Amended notice substituted for those published in the London Gazette of Nov 21:

HITCH, EVAN CAMEROB, Holnwood rd, Brixton Hill Dec 1 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HOPKINS, CHRISTOPHER, East Ham, Builder Nov 30 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MCANULTY, JAMES, Walling st Dec 2 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Nov 25:

HINCHELFFE, THOMAS TRACKWAY, Hartgate, Joiner Dec 5 at 2.30 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York

## ADJUDICATIONS.

ARMAN, WILLIAM LUND, Withernsea, Yorks Kingston upon Hull Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

BAUM, FRANK, Bowdon, Cheshire, Photographer Manchester Pet Nov 12 Ord Nov 24

BAYLIS, JOHN, Tipton, Staffs, Sugar Boiler Dudley Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24

BOWEN, ARTHUR KIRK, Union st, Tin Plate Merchant High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Nov 22

BRAGO, CHARLES, Leeds, Fruit Merchant Leeds Pet Nov 23 Ord Nov 23

BREARLEY, HERBERT HAROLD, Rochdale, Coal Merchant  
Rochdale Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 26  
BROWN, THOMAS, Curran rd, Upholsterer High Court Pet  
Oct 20 Ord Nov 25  
CARTER, ARTHUR HERBERT, Kettering, Northampton,  
Insurance Agent Northampton Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov  
26  
CAUSTON, HOWARD CHARLES, Totland Bay, I of W, Civil  
Engineer Newport and Ryde Pet Oct 27 Ord Nov  
26  
COOK, HENRY, Grove rd, Bow, Boat Manufacturer High  
Court Pet Oct 20 Ord Nov 25  
COOKE, HARRY, Nonnaco, Longton, Electrical Engineer  
Stoke upon Trent Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25  
COOKE, THOMAS, jun, Reading, Clothier Reading Pet Nov  
10 Ord Nov 23  
CROFTHER, GEORGE ARTHUR, Cheetham, Manchester, Drug  
Dealer Salford Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24  
CURSTON, WALTER, Manchester, Patent Glazing Engineer  
Manchester Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 25  
DESLER, JAMES, Houndsditch, Watchmaker High Court  
Pet Sept 21 Ord Nov 22  
DOWLAND, SYDNEY THOMAS, and FRED RICHARDS, Park-  
stone, Dorset, Builders Poole Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26  
FLOWERS, THOMAS, JOHN WEYMAN, and WILLIAM ROW,  
Earls Barton, Northampton, Boot Manufacturers  
Northampton Pet Oct 24 Ord Nov 26  
FORD, CHARLES, Kingston upon Hull Kingston upon Hull  
Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25  
FOSTER, WILLIAM STEWART, Fulwell, nr Sunderland, Clerk  
Sunderland Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24  
GASKELL, WALTER JOHN, and ARTHUR REDFERN HALSALL,  
Liverpool, General Merchants Liverpool Pet Nov 26  
Ord Nov 26  
GEARING, E. A., Seaford, Sussex, Butcher Lewes Pet Oct  
4 Ord Nov 26  
GOOD, HENRY, Killingholme, Lincs, Brick Merchant Gt  
Grimsby Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 25  
GREEN, HARRY, Barby, Thornton in Craven, Yorks, Tin  
Plate Worker Bradford Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26  
HEATHCOTE, JAMES, Lyme, Handley, Chester Farmer  
Macclesfield Pet Nov 22 Ord Nov 23  
HITCH, EVAN CAMERON, Holmwood rd, Brinxton hill High  
Court Pet Oct 14 Ord Nov 25  
LVD, FREDERICK, and HERBERT LIND, Margate, Bakers  
Canterbury Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25  
ISLIER, THOMAS, Leeds, Manufacturer's Agent Leeds  
Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25  
JESTER, ERNEST, Birmingham, Corn Factor Birmingham  
Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 24  
JUD, ARTHUR, Goldhawk rd, Cabinet Manufacturer High  
Court Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26  
KENNELLY, JURA PAGE, and THOMAS BARTLETT, West-  
bourne grove, Land Agents Wandsworth Pet July 26  
Ord Nov 24  
LUND, WILLIAM, Scarborough, Licensed Victualler  
Scarborough Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25  
MACDONALD, DONALD, Hastingsleigh, Kent, Farmer Canter-  
bury Pet Nov 4 Ord Nov 24  
MARSH, GEORGE SAMUEL JAMES, Croydon, Bricklayer  
Croydon Pet Oct 27 Ord Nov 25  
MAW, SAMUEL ALEXANDER, Needham Market, Suffolk  
Bury St Edmunds Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 25  
MORAN, ARTHUR, Broadheath, nr Altrincham, Chester  
Grocer Manchester Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24  
PHILLIPS, WILLIAM ANDREW, Scarborough, Hydro Pro-  
prietor Scarborough Pet Oct 15 Ord Nov 26  
RIGGS, FLETCHER, Hadfield, nr Manchester Ashton under  
Lyme Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 24  
SMITH, MAEMADUKE VALENTINE, Liverpool, Newspaper  
Proprietor High Court Pet Sept 16 Ord Nov 21  
THORPE, EMMA JANE, Flixton, nr Manchester, Commission  
Agent Manchester Pet Nov 24 Ord Nov 24  
WOOD, RICHARD, Broadgar, Kent, Farmer Rochester Pet  
Nov 24 Ord Nov 24  
WOODS, JOHN THOMAS, Long Sutton, Lincoln, Farmer King's  
Lynn Pet Nov 26 Ord Nov 26  
YOUNG, ELIJAH, Flagg Burgh, Norfolk, Market Gardener  
Gt Yarmouth Pet Nov 25 Ord Nov 25

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the  
SOLICITORS' JOURNAL with regularity it is  
requested that application be made direct to  
the Publisher, at 27, Chancery-lane.

Annual Subscriptions, WHICH MUST BE PAID  
IN ADVANCE: SOLICITORS' JOURNAL and  
WEEKLY REPORTER, in Wrapper, 52s.,  
post-free. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL only, 26s.;  
Country, 28s.; Foreign, 30s. 4d. WEEKLY  
REPORTER, in Wrapper, 26s.; Country or  
Foreign, 28s.

Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 9d.; half  
law calf, 5s. 6d.

LAW.—GREAT SAVING.—For prompt  
payment 25 per cent. will be taken off the following  
writing charges:—

Abstracts Copied	...	s. d.
Briefs and Drafts	...	0 8 per sheet.
Deeds Bound Hand	...	2 3 per 20 folios.
Deeds Abstracted	...	0 2 per folio.
Full Copies	...	2 0 per sheet.
PAPER.—Foolscap, 14. per sheet; Draft, 4d. ditto;		
Parchment, 1s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. per skin.		

KERR & LANHAM, 16, Fumival-street, Holborn, E.C.

## Solicitors' Journal & Weekly Reporter.

The General Contents of the **SOLICITORS' JOURNAL** comprises CURRENT TOPICS; LEADING ARTICLES; REPORTS OF CASES OF THE WEEK (furnished by Barristers in the various Courts); REVIEWS OF NEW LAW BOOKS; CORRESPONDENCE ON MATTERS OF PROFESSIONAL INTEREST; NEW RULES AND ORDERS, with explanations of their effect; PENDING LEGISLATION; LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR; APPOINTMENTS AND OBITUARY; REPORTS OF MEETINGS AND PROCEEDINGS OF LAW SOCIETIES; GAZETTES, &c.; Summary of the Legal News of the Week; and special attention is bestowed on furnishing early copies of all New Rules, Orders, and Court Papers.

The **WEEKLY REPORTER** contains full reports of the facts, arguments, and judgments in all the important cases decided in the House of Lords, the Privy Council, the Court of Appeal, each of the Divisions of the High Court, and the Court of Bankruptcy. Every effort is made to publish the reports as speedily after the decision of a case as possible. Subscribers to the **WEEKLY REPORTER** receive a copy of the Annual Digest, and a copy of all the important Statutes of the year.

### NEW VOLUMES COMMENCED ON NOVEMBER 5TH, 1904.

#### ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE:

**SOLICITORS' JOURNAL** and **WEEKLY REPORTER**, in wrapper, 52s., post-free; Single Number, 1s.

**SOLICITORS' JOURNAL ONLY**, 26s.; Country, 28s.; Foreign, 30s. 4d.; Single Number, 6d.

**WEEKLY REPORTER**, in wrapper, 26s.; Country or Foreign, 28s.; Single Number, 6d.

## ORDER FORM.

190.

Please send the **SOLICITORS' JOURNAL** and **WEEKLY REPORTER** from \_\_\_\_\_

until countermanded. I enclose cheque for \_\_\_\_\_, my Subscription

for \_\_\_\_\_ months.

The **JOURNAL** and **REPORTER** can be ordered from any date, and back numbers of the current volumes can be supplied.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to H. VILLERS.

Office: 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

**WANTED**, in City Solicitor's Office, Young  
Shorthand (Pitman) and Typist (Smith Premier);  
previous experience in solicitor's office indispensable, also  
quickness in taking down and transcribing.—Address,  
stating age, experience, actual speeds, wages required.—  
Z. E. 661, Messrs. Deacon's, Leadenhall-street, E.C.

**MR. STOCKBRIDGE**, Blackburn House,  
South Lambeth-road, London, undertakes Con-  
fidential Inquiries, including Divorce (Ex-Managing Clerk  
of 30 years' experience without supervision); Expert  
Settling Costs; unexceptionable references.

**BURGESS'S INVESTIGATION**  
BUREAU.—Reliable Information in Divorce, and  
all confidential cases at home and abroad; write for terms,  
31, King William-street, London, E.C.; an unsullied  
record for 50 years with the legal profession.

**TO BE LET**, Convenient and Quiet Offices,  
containing three rooms, in the City, suitable for  
solicitors.—Apply, 2, Fenchurch-buildings, London, E.C.

**GENTLEMAN** engaged in insurance work  
is open to undertake the Secretarial Duties of a small  
Industrial or Mining Company; office and all necessary  
clerical assistance included at small inclusive salary; first-  
class references given and required.—Address, S. Y., care  
of Street's, 40, Cornhill, E.C.

**TO INVESTORS**.—The Subscriber has  
valuable Timber Lands in America for sale; excellent  
investment, increasing values.—L. E. Spock, 614, Leaden-  
hall-street, E.C.

**TO SOLICITORS**.—Required, a Mortgage  
of £1,000 at 4½ per Cent. upon Freehold Cottages,  
situated adjacent to Collieries, let at 5s. 6d. per week each.  
—Westmore, 44, Fumival-street, Holborn.

**MORTGAGES**.—Messrs. LUMLEYS have  
Clients with Funds to be put out at Low Rates of  
Interest on sound Properties in London and country.—"et.  
James's House," 22, St. James's-street, London, S.W.

**MORTGAGES** at 3½ to 4 per Cent. per  
annum.—£50,000 immediately available and to be  
Advanced upon Landed Estates or other First-class Prop-  
erty (in one or more sums); must be good margin.—  
Please communicate full particulars to Messrs. MORRIST  
& MORRIST, 9 and 10, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.  
Telephone No. 4059 Avenue.

**HIPPODROME. TWICE DAILY.**  
Prices 1s. to 5s. 6d.; private boxes, 1 to 4 guineas.  
**SPECIAL NOTICE**.—Children under 12 are admitted at  
half-price to all parts (amphitheatre excepted) at MORN-  
ING PERFORMANCES ONLY.—Box-office 10.0 a.m. to  
10.0 p.m. Telegrams, "Hippodrome, London." Telephone  
4015 Gerrard.

**EGYPTIAN HALL**.—England's Home of  
Mystery. Established 30 years.—Lessee and Manager,  
Mr. J. N. Maskelyne.—DAILY, at Three and Eight, the  
Christmas Programme, brimful of fun, wonder, and novelty,  
including the greatest mystery of modern times, entitled  
"WELL, I'M —!" Invented by Hor Valadon. The  
mechanism devised by Mr. Nevil Maskelyne.  
**THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE**.—In consequence of  
the great favour with which the Merry Magical Romance  
has been received it will remain in the programme.  
A new and beautiful series of Animated Photographs.  
Prices 6s., 3s., 2s., and 1s. Children under 12 half-price.

**MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.**  
Baker-street Station.  
In connection with Trains and Buses from all parts.  
Well Lighted, Well Heated, and Well Ventilated.  
**THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR.**  
Life-like Portrait Models of  
**H.I.M. THE Czar of Russia.**  
**H.M. THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN,**  
**ADMIRAL ALEXEIEFF, ADMIRAL TOGO,**  
**GENERAL KUROPATKIN, MARQUIS ITO,**  
**FIELD-MARSHAL YAMAGATA, &c.**

Madame Tussaud's Roumanian Band.  
Delightful Music. Afternoon Teas.  
Special Quartette in Tea Room.  
Admission, 1s.; Children under 12, 6d. Open 10 till 10.  
**MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.**